

6
SOME
REMARKS
UPON
Sir JAMES DALRYMPLE'S
Historical Collections.

With an ANSWER to the
VINDICATION of the *Ecclesiastical*
Part of Them.

WHERE
The ancient *Settlement* of the SCOTS in *Britain*;
Their early Conversion to *Christianity*;
The Government of their Church by *Bishops*;
and some of their *Ecclesiastical Rites* and
Customs, are Considered, and Cleared from
the *Mistakes* of several Learned AUTHORS.

*Supersunt mihi quæ scribam, sed parco sciens;
Primum tibi esse ne videar molestior,
Distringit quem multarum rerum varietas:
Dein si quis eadem forte conari velit,
Habere ut possit aliquid operis residui:
Quamvis materia tanta abundet copia,
Labori Faber ut desit, non Fabro labor.*

PHŒDR. Lib. iv. Fab. 25.



EDINBURGH,
Printed. Sold by GEORGE STEWART, at the Book and Angel. 1714.

John Bellamy Bishop of
Vet. A4. e. 1

ERRATA.

PAge 1. Line 2. for *Objections*, read *Observations*. P. 21. L. ult. f. *Nenwius's*, r. *Nennius's*. P. 26. L. ult. f. *Celerma*, r. *Celerina*. P. 28. L. 9. f. *Basilios*, r. *Basilicas*. P. 40. L. 8. f. *Dot*. r. *Not*. P. 49. L. 8. f. *Diorianus*, r. *Dimanus*. *Ibid.* L. 9. f. *Laustianus*, r. *Laustranus*. *Ibid.* L. 25. f. *Eigfred*, r. *Ecgfred*. P. 52. L. 6. f. *Daranus*, r. *Saranus*. P. 70. L. 7. f. *Herin*, r. *Hern*. *Ibid.* L. 18. f. *Druma*, r. *Diuma*. P. 88. L. 2. f. *could*, r. *would*. P. 135. L. 12. f. *as when*, r. *when*. P. 160. f. *dominationibus*, r. *donationibus*.





*Some Remarks upon Sir James
Dalrymple's Historical Col-
lections, &c.*

By Mr John Gillon Bishop
as was Dr Jagers Life.

C H A P. I.

BEING resolv'd to make some
Objections upon Sir JAMES
DALRYMPLE's *Historical
Collections*, and to give my Sen-
timents concerning the *Vindi-
cation of the Ecclesiastical Part*
of them, I shall endeavour to do Both with all
Brevity and Candor. It is not material whe-
ther the *Vindicator* be Sir James himself or
another: The Stile and Manner of Writing
resemble very much that of the *Collections*: But
there is another Reason that makes it seem
probable, that Sir James has been at the
Trouble to undertake his own Defence. As
A that

that learned Gentleman has given, in his *Historical Collections*, a goodly Specimen of no small Diligence and Concern to assert the Honour, and defend the Rights of his Country; so his Calmness and Civility deserve no mean Applauses: He has written with much more Temper, and much liker to a Gentleman than most of the *Scotish* Presbyterians have done of late: He has not been liberal of giving Names to those who differ from him: He has spoken honourably of the Church of *England*, and paid due Regards to many of her learn'd Defenders, nay to some of the *High-Flyers* themselves. Even Mr. *Atwood* has not from him that coarse Entertainment, which his Merit would have gone far to justify. Just so the *Vindicator*, tho' he seems to have been somewhat angry, and in some Expressions to have been injurious to his Adversary; yet where Zeal for himself, or his Friend, and his Party did not transport him, he has treated him with Ingenuity enough. I am very far mistaken, if the Writer of Mr. *Sage's* Life (a) is not sorry that Sir James has taken Offence at any Thing he has advanced; for it was not his Intention to give him the least Ground of Dissatisfaction, but merely to declare the Truth, as to the State of Religion, and of the Churches in these Places, as it appear'd to him. The *Vindicator* complains (b), that Sir James has been attack'd with much Eagerness and Humour. I do indeed con-

(a) *Vid. Hist. Collect. Pref. pag. 47.* (b) *Pref. last page.*

confess, that his Adversary has shew'd some Concern; and no Wonder, since he thinks the Dispute is concerning a Thing of no small Moment: But I do not at all see, that he has discovered any Thing of that which we commonly call Humour, *i. e.* ill Nature; I am sure, if I have not mistaken the Person, he would heartily beg Sir *James's* Pardon, if he were conscious to himself, that he had in the least given him any just Occasion of Offence, or transgressed the Laws of Civility. This I am sure of, Sir *James* has not only dissented from many Authors, but treated several of them with more Severity, than his Opinions have been attack'd with by his Antagonist. Sir *James's* Business is wholly about ancient Matters of Fact, which can only be prov'd by competent Authorities: Testimonies and Interpretations of them, Comments upon them, Conjectures occasion'd by them, and Consequences drawn from them, are all the Proofs he pretends to; and the Subject is not capable of more. Now any Body who considers his Book attentively, may observe, that there are few, if any, of his Authors, whose Credit he himself has not been at pains, on some Occasion or another, to invalidate. I have the Passages, beside me, particularly marked; but my Design will not allow me to trouble the Reader with all of them at present. It will be sufficient to bring some Instances, by which it will appear that he has treated his Authors with

Eagerness and Humour, nay with *Rudeness and Scurrility*, if the *Vindicator's* Judgment must be the Rule of good Manners; else Sir *James* must have a peculiar Privilege beyond the rest of Mankind. Thus for Example (c), *Simeon Dunelmensis de obsessioe Dunelmi*, places this Siege of Durham by Malcolm King of Scots, Anno 969--- where the numerous Army of the Scots was almost cut off --- This great Victory is not recorded in *Chron. Sax.* nor will it agree with any of the Kings nam'd Malcolm ---- and yet the Author ascribes it to Malcolm II. ---- so I reckon it to be a fictitious Miracle, ascrib'd by later Churchmen to the Honour of their Patron St. Cuthbert. And again in the same Page, *Simeon Dunelmensis* hath another imaginary Siege of Durham by Duncan King of Scots. (d) *Lhuwyde* tells a Story full of Inconsistencies. (e) *Mr. Atwood's Book* bears the most false and arrogant Title, Of the Superiority and direct Dominion, &c. and (f) this is all founded on a mere whim of our Author (a Term he useth against Persons of far greater Note than himself) supported by his own Imagination against Reason, and the Authority of all Writers concerning this Island.

BUT that which is a little more considerable, is Sir *James's* Impartiality: He has not so much as spar'd his own Countrymen the *Scottish* Historians themselves. *Andrew Winton*, tho' friendly

(c) Page 103, 104. (d) Page 93. (e) Pref. page 6. (f) *Ibid.* page 7.

friendly enough to his Country, a Prior of *Lochlevin*, once a Monastery of the *Culdees*, (for which Sir *James* might have shew'd him some Kindness) (g) *has many inconsistent Stories*. Indeed *Fordon*, the great *Fordon* himself, the original *Scotish Presbyterian* Historian; *Fordon*, to whom Mr. *David Buchanan*, the Prefacer to the interpolated Edition of *Knox's* History, and *Blondel*, and *Selden*, owe what they have deliver'd concerning the ancient Government of the *Scotish Kirk*; even *Fordon*, I say, as well as *Winton*, must bear Sir *James's* Feud, when he falls not in with his Hypotheses. Thus when *Fordon* and *Winton* say, that *Kellach* was the *second* Bishop of *St. Andrew's*, and that he was contemporary with King *Gregory*, a King so eminently devoted to the Church, that he could not want a Bishop; Sir *James* has Two Things to object, (b) *First*, The Description they give of him agreeth better to a Saint or devote Churchman, than to a Bishop; so I add to complete the Antithesis: For it seems *Kellach* could not be both a Saint or a devote Churchman, and a Bishop too, in Sir *James's* Way of reckoning. But this is not all: For *Secondly*, (i) If he was a Bishop, these Authors (*Fordon* and *Winton*) were inconsistent with themselves. And (k) the *greatest Inconsistency* is, That *Fordon* and *Winton* call *Kellach* a Bishop contemporary with King *Gregory*; in which Case they ought to have made him the

A 3 first

(g) Page 107. (h) Page 125, 126. (i) *Ibid.* (k) Page 127.

first Bishop---- So that I rather believe that Kellach was not a Bishop, but a Presbyter in the Time of Gregory. And the Inscription on the New Testament at St. Andrew's is a better Evidence, than any Thing adduced, i. e. than either *Winton* or *Fordon's* Authorities: Which Inscription bears, that *Fothad*, who was the first Bishop, lived Anno 960, when *Indulphus* was King, that is, after (long after, says Sir *James*) the Death of *Gregory*. It seems then pretty plain that *Fordon* could write Inconsistencies, and make Bishops, when he had a mind for it. And why might he not make Presbyterian Governments too 1100, as well as Bishops 400 Years before his own Time? Whatever his Authority is, according to Sir *James*, it must be far below the Authority of the mentioned *Inscription*. But pray from whom have we this Inscription? Why, from those very Gentlemen *Fordon* and *Winton*. Now I will not stay to ask, if it was not as easy for *Fordon* who liv'd before *Winton*, to feign an *Inscription*, as to forge Bishops and Kirk Governments? All I observe is this, that if *Fordon* found such an *Inscription* on *Fothad's New Testament*, and yet was not able to adjust his own Positions to it, but contradicted it, it would seem that he has not much regarded the Authority of the Inscription. But what is this Inscription? Why *Fordon* has it one

Way

Way, and *Winton* another. *Fordon's* runs thus, as Sir *James* gives it (l).

*Hanc Evangelii thecam construxit avites,
Fothad qui primus Scotus Episcopus est.*

Winton has it thus (m).

*Hanc Evangelii thecam construxit aviti,
Fodach qui primus Scotiae Episcopus erat.*

HERE we see Three Differences. *Fordon* has *avites*, *Winton* *aviti*, a Difference of some Consequence, as small as it appears. *Avites* is certainly wrong, and therefore Sir *James* on his Margin puts *avitus*, which, if the right reading, imports that the Inscription was written long after *Fothad's* Time, *avitus Fothad*. But then how comes in the *est*: He lived long ago, and yet he is at that very Time the first Bishop! This is a little awkward. The second Difference is in the Name. *Fordon* calls him *Fothad*, *Winton* *Fodach*. *Iannes* and *Iambres* differ not much more. The third Difference is no less material, where *Fordon* has *est*, *Winton* has *erat*: Indeed the more nicely one compares the two Copies, the more clearly he will find that *Winton's* has the Advantage. *Fordon's* *avitus* and *est* do not so well accord; *Winton's* *aviti*, construed with *Evangelii*, and his *erat* agree much better. But then there are other

two Things observable about both, the one is, that neither of them makes *Fothad* or *Fodauch* the Writer of the *Inscription*. Neither of them can well allow him to have been the Writer of it. He only made the silver Case. The *Inscription* for any Thing any Man alive knows, might have been put on near 400 Years after *Fothad* died, and yet have been very well cited by *Fordon*. The other Thing is, that neither of them seem to have been very nice at making Verse; for the second Line can be reduc'd to no Kind, as either *Winton* or *Fordon* have it.

BUT tho' they had agreed better, and had made good Numbers too, yet we had not wanted some Difficulties: For Sir *James* (n) gives us another Copy different from both the former, thus:

*Hanc Evangelii thecam construxit aviti,
Fothet qui Scotis summus Episcopus est.*

Here we have a third Name; for *Fothet* is neither *Fothad* nor *Fothauch*, and then where both *Fordon* and *Winton* have *primus*, that Copy has *summus*: And the *Excerpta Registri prioratus S. Andreae*, from which Sir *James* transcribes it, offers at a Reason why it should be *summus*. And which is more, that Register was begun long before the Days either of *Fordon* or *Winton*. Sir *James* (o) will have some
part

(n) P. 127. (o) Page 123.

part of it to have been written in the Days of *David I.* and it is to be presum'd, that being a *Register*, Things were recorded in it according to the Order of Time, and by Consequence, this *Inscription*, written on *Fothad's* New Testament, was written long before King *David's* Days; and therefore the Copy in the Register is most to be regarded. Yet Sir *James* thinks otherwise, for he has been at Pains to reject it: And no Wonder, it was by all means to be rejected. *Summus Episcopus!* a Monster! it has too much of a *Roman* Sound, and has too much of a *Primate* in its Signification, and imports that in *Fothad's* Time there were other *Scotish* Bishops besides himself, and this would have spoiled a great part of Sir *James's* Book, the Design whereof is to make Bishops of a very late Standing in the ancient Kingdom.

INDEED this *Register* of the *Priory* of St. *Andrews* has oftner than once disoblig'd Sir *James* (p). It makes *Regulus* to have been a *Lishop*: And a Bishop he must not have been; for he is call'd by *Fordon*, *Beatus* or *Abbas*, but not a *Bishop* by him or *Winton*. And it tells ridiculous Stories about the Dreams of Bishop *Regulus*, and *Hungus* King of the *Picts*, and St. *Regulus* building Chapels in every Place where he landed between *Patras* and St. *Andrew's*, whither he brought that Saint's Reliques. Sir *James* says exprefly of it (q), that
it

(p) Vide Page 120, 121, 122. (q) Page 113.

it is not to be credited (in the Accounts of Religion, of Churches and Possessions granted by Hungus to St. Rule,) which they narrate to justify the Innovations then brought into the Churches. And yet in that very Page, nay in the Words immediately following, and even in the Accounts it gives of Religion, it is to be credited. However (says Sir James) by this Reprehension we are furnish'd with a Part of the true History of the Culdees, not to be found elsewhere, &c.

AND what tho' Fordon worsted the Register in the Matter of the *Inscription* upon *Fothad's* New Testament, and in that of *Regulus* being a Bishop; yet it shall worst him again: For Sir James (r) taking to task *Reliquiæ divi Andreae*, written by the late ingenious and learned Mr. *George Martin* of *Clermont*, expresseth himself thus: *I observe that he (the Author) hath not been very exact in the Chronology, and taketh up too much Time in relating fabulous Stories; and particularly of the Translation of the Reliques of St. Andrew by St. Rule to Kilrimont; which following Fordon and Boeis, he placeth before the Time of Fergus II. whereas it hath been made appear from the Exerpts of the Register, that it was in the Time of Hungus.*

I could proceed, and shew how cavalierly Sir James has treated others of our Historians: But, I think, it may appear by what has been

been already said, that he hath used them with more Severity, than what this Vindicator complains he hath met with from the Writer of *Mr. Sage's Life*. *Fictitious Miracles, imaginary Sieges, Stories full of Inconsistencies, most false and arrogant Titles of Books, Assertions founded on mere Whims, supported by the Author's own Imagination, against Reason and the Authority of all Writers, Authors inconsistent with themselves, &c.* will amount to more than has been said concerning Two of Sir *James's* darling Paradoxes; and, I am sure, that all that due Respect was payed to himself, which he justly deserves from his Countrymen and the learned World. The old Saying of *Pu-
blius Syrus, Ab alio expectes, quod alteri fece-
ris*, is most certain, and confirmed by daily Experience: And, tho' our most holy Religion allows no Retaliation of Injuries; yet it is not at all reasonable, that one should complain of being treated ill by others, when they but follow his own Example. For my Part, I do not think, but Sir *James*, or any other, may upon some Occasions, use those Words, without transgressing the Rules of Decency; because the Subject and Circumstances may render them sometimes necessary: And, if the Writer of the Life has proved clearly, that Sir *James's* Opinions are groundless, and supported by no Shadow of Reason or Authority, I do not see where the Fault lies. And, I think, suppose he had transgressed, Sir *James*
may

may content himself with having paid him home in his own Coin, and that with Interest : Besides, that the *Vindicator* has returned to him his own Words, (f) he adds, *Tho' his Name be unknown, he plainly discovers himself to be a High-Flyer, and for propogating and extending the Episcopal Order beyond its due Bounds ; and, if he be a Scotsman, for overturning maliciously the Government of his Mother Church.* I can assure Sir James, that his Antagonist (if he be the same Person that I take him to be) is so far from owning the *Presbyterian Kirk* to be his Mother Church, that he never in all his Life, communicated with her in any Act of Divine Worship : And, if I be not much mistaken about him, he is not so vain as to think he is able to overturn any Government ; and he is fully convinced, that the least Degree of Malice would spoil and dishonour the most virtuous Action or commendable Undertaking. He will be so far from being angry with the *Vindicator* for giving him the odious Name of *High-Flyer*, tho' it raises in the Minds of some People the most invidious and frightful Idea's, that on the contrary, I will presume in his Name, to return his most humble and hearty Thanks : For he will always reckon it an Honour, to be thought an Admirer of those excellent, pious, and learned Men, who have boldly asserted and strenuously defended the *Rights* of the *Christian*

(f) *Vindic. of the Collec. P. 24, 25.*

stian Church and Clergy, against their Adversaries, both of *Low-Church* and *No-Church*.

HE will also heartily pardon the Injury done to him by the *Vindicator*, when he says, (t) *It is proper in the next Place to add something in defence of what Sir James has advanc'd concerning Elizabeth Muir's Marriage, and the Legitimacy of Robert the III. for which Sir James has been very rudely and surprisngly attack'd by the Writer of Mr. Sage's Life.* What Reason there is for this heavy Charge will best appear from what is said, on that Subject, in *Mr. Sage's Life*. And it is this: (u) *The Vigour of his Mind was as strong and lively as ever; as may be seen from an Introduction to Drummond of Hawthornden's History of the five King James's, written by him and published in the Year 1711: Which is a Piece of excellent Criticism, wherein the scattered Arguments for the Legitimacy of Robert the III. are brought together, the Mistakes of no mean Authors are modestly and justly censured, and the whole Matter rendred more clear and distinct, than ever had been done before, to the great Satisfaction of all honest and loyal Men.* There is not one Word more, in all the *Life*, upon that Subject: And if there be any Rudeness here, I shall leave it to be determined by the *Vindicator* himself, *sed non iracundo*.

HE

(t) *Vindication*, Pag. 48. (u) *Life of Mr. Sage*, Pag. 33.

HE is again (x) pleased to express himself after this Manner, *It is not my Intention here to enter into the Detail of these Reflections, which our Biographer with great Rudeness and Scurrility, makes upon the Writings of several worthy and reverend Divines now deceased.* The Writer of the Life was obliged by his Subject and Design to give an Account of Mr. Sage's Writings, and to mention the Performances of his Adversaries, that gave Occasion to some of them. And since he resolved at the same Time to defend and preserve the Memory of his excellent Friend, and also charitably to warn the Ignorant from being imposed upon by the Pamphlets of his Antagonists, he could not omit to make some short but just Reflections upon them. Two of those Authors were such, that it would be impossible for the best natur'd Man alive to find out Words, by which he could impartially represent their Faults, without some Appearance of Severity. The one upon all Occasions, in the Pulpit railed furiously at the distressed Church and its sincere Members; and did what he could to incense those in Power, and the Populace against them; and he would needs, forsooth, print one of his good natur'd Preachings; upon which Mr. Sage was at the Pains to write some *Remarks*. Mr. R---le, besides his other civil, charitable and accurate Performances, wrote a Pamphlet to excuse and extenuate the most atrocious

trocious and barbarous Rabbling of the *Ministers* in the *West*, when the contrary was known to the whole Nation, and sadly felt by too too many Families. This he did after the learned Mr. *Alexander Pitcairn* and some others had declined so shameful, disingenous and unchristian a Task; and truly in my Opinion, if we consider the Characters of the Persons, and all other Circumstances, the defending and excusing of those Cruelties and Barbarities are more aggravated, than the very Commission of them. It was no Wonder therefore tho' they were treated with more than ordinary Severity. But the *Vindicator* is in the Wrong, when he calls it Rudeness and Scurrility. The Author of the *Life* gives them no Names, nor uses *Billingsgate*, which Mr. *R-----le* was too much guilty of. Nothing is said of Mr. *Meldrum*, but that *he seemed altogether a Stranger to true Church Principles*. Mr. *Forrester* is call'd the *Goliath of the Party*. And these are all the Presbyterian Rabbies, that are mention'd in that Essay upon the Life of the ever famous Mr. *Sage*.

C H A P. II.

SIR *James Dalrymple* has discovered in his Collections a very valuable Modesty, a Modesty far from that Peremptoriness of Dogmatizing so much in Fashion with those of his Party. I shall not trouble my self to enquire whether his *Vindicator* has follow'd so good an Example or not. Tho' Sir *James* has plainly enough told his own Sentiments, yet he has obligingly protested against imposing them on others: And (a) *wherein he is mistaken in his Performance, he professes, he shall be willing to make all due Acknowledgments upon sufficient Proof, and shall be so far from blaming any, who shall with Candour and Civility offer the same, that he shall be ready to render them his humble and hearty Thanks.* Who so, therefore, after so much Condescension, should treat Sir *James* with any Degrees of Rudeness, should, in my Opinion, be none of the most mannerly. But then,

It may, I hope, consist with good Manners to tell Sir *James*, that many, not only of his ingenious Countrymen, but even Strangers, to my certain Knowledge, wish earnestly he would be pleas'd to revise his Book, and give a new Edition of it: For in their Opinion, divers Things in it want to be corrected.

NEXT

(a) *Pref. Collect. Pag. 83.*

NEXT to Truth and Impartiality, I know no greater Ornament of any Book than clear and distinct Method. Truths themselves lose of their Lustre; nay are many Times obscured by being thrown down carelessly, and in Confusion. To be sure it were very easy for Sir *James* to put what he has said in better Order. I know I am far from being singular in this Remark: I think, Sir *James* himself seems oftner than once to have been sensible of it. This is no great Matter; therefore to have named it, is enough.

NEITHER shall I insist on something that looks somewhat like to Negligence, I mean his Inadvertancy in wording divers Things. The Wits and Critics of this Age are nice, and apt to teaze every Thing that seems to look like Blunder. This I confess can be of no great Weight with thinking People: But then sure, it is best to avoid such Inconveniencies, if we can. I will only hint at a few Instances.

SIR *James* talking of Mr. *Atwood's* Rudeness to divers of his own learned and worthy Countrymen, goes on in these Words: (b) *He is in a special manner unjust to the right reverend before-mentioned Prelate, (Doctor Nicolson Bishop of Carlisle) and Mr. Tyrrel, who had discovered in their Writings great Inclination to be equal and fair to both Nations, and with whom I have found myself obliged to differ in some Matters, wherein I conceive they seem to*

B

have

(b) *Pref. Collect. pag. 41, 42.*

have favour'd their own Country. How do the Parts of this Sentence hang together? If Sir *James* conceiv'd that they seem'd partial in dispensing their Favours to their own Country, how could he say, that they had discovered in their Writings great Inclination to be equal and fair to both Nations? How could their Inclination to be equal and fair to Both, be great; if at the same Time they were partial, and bestowed undue Favours on one? If their Favour to their Country was impartial and innocent, what could oblige Sir *James* to differ from them?

AGAIN, Sir *James* discoursing of the *Scottish* Reformation from *Popery*, and the Laws made for securing it, and the Coronation Oath *Anno 1567.* he has these Words, (c) *These were enacted for reviving the ancient fundamental Qualifications of the Monarchs, and the Rights of this Kingdom, whereby the professing and maintaining of the true reformed Religion, and the lowable Laws concerning it, became a Part of the Coronation Oath, &c.* I am not now to enquire into the Antiquity of Coronation Oaths, tho' I doubt very much, if they were in Use in the Days of King *Fergus I.* All I ask is this, If those Statutes contriv'd for securing the true reformed Religion, and the Coronation Oath framed *Anno 1567,* were design'd to revive the ancient fundamental Qualifications of the Monarchs and Rights of the

(c) *Pref. page 53.*

the Kingdom, must it not of Necessity follow, that the *Scots* were Christians, and profess'd the reform'd Religion too, before the ancient and fundamental Qualifications of their Monarchs were determined? And if so, what is become of all those *Scotish* Kings, who reign'd so many Years before our Saviour's Incarnation? Who can be so ridiculous as to say, that those early Monarchs were bound by solemn Coronation Oaths, to profess and maintain the true reformed Christian Religion, and the allowable Laws concerning it, 330 Years before Christianity had any Being, and more than 500 Years before our Monarchs embraced it?

Thirdly, Sir *James* has a surprising Guess concerning *Marchmont*. (d) *The Castle of Roxburgh is called Marchmont by Fordon, a Name perhaps given it by the Romans, esteeming it a Fort set upon the March or Boundary of the World.* This is said with a *Perhaps*: But any *Perhaps* whatsoever is never a Whit the worse for being attended with some Shew of Probability. Doth *Marchmont* so much as sound *Roman* like: *Marchmund* had come some nearer to a Boundary of the World; but *Marchia* is not good *Latin* for a March or Limit; and tho' it had been, yet the Analogy would have required it to be rather *Mundimarchia*: But call it *Marchmund*, and say it is *Roman* too, yet something aukward still remains. If the *Romans* gave it that Name, deeming it the

Boundary of the habitable World, it behoved them to have given it before *Virgil's* Time, *i. e.* long before the *Romans* had penetrated within 200 Miles of *Roxburgh*: For even in his Time, it was known, it seems, that *Thule* was fitter to be called *Marchmund*, than any Place on this side the North. If he meant only the *Roman* World, *Roxburgh* has had its *Roman* Name of *Marchmund* earlier than I thought: To be sure, before either *Severus's* Wall or *Buchanan's Templum termini* were built, before *Lollius Urbicus* came to this Part of *Britain*, nay even before *Julius Agricola's* Expeditions, as we have them related by *Tacitus*. For then the *Roman* World, so denominated from their Conquests, was extended a good many Miles North of *Roxburgh*. But if, after all, Sir *James* will needs persist in his Opinion, that it had such a Name, and for such a Reason, and from the *Romans*, let him enjoy it.

Fourthly, Sir *James* inclining to do Honour, as it seems, to the Memory of *David I.* King of *Scots*, writes thus: (e) *M. Paris gives him this Testimony, viz. Magnæ sanctitatis & mirificæ largitatis, which is an Insinuation by this Author, that his Liberality was to the Excess: However his Bounty to the Church made him deservedly called by his Successor K. James VI. A fore Saint to the Crown.* I leave it to the Critics to judge, whether Sir *James* has justly interpreted *mirificæ largitatis*. That which

which I take notice of is, that Sir *James* fairly seems to have been very willing to believe, that King *David's* Liberality was to the Excess: And if so, he has had strange Notions. Can excessive Bounty, *i. e.* Prodigality, which my Masters always called a Vice, deservedly entitle one to the Name of a Saint? But then, such a Saint, as could also deservedly be called by one descended of his own Loins, a *fove*, that is, as I take it, an injurious, *Saint to the Crown.* Admirable Saintship!

ONCE more Sir *James* discoursing of the Noble Family of the *Setons*, writes thus: (f) *The third Earl was George ----- his eldest Son being abroad is not returned.* It seems Sir *James* was afraid his Reader might think, the Lord *Seton* could be both abroad and at home at the same Time!

I have not taken Notice of these Escapes, as if I thought that Sir *James* meant Ill by any of them: And they are all in Matters of no great Moment: Yet I thought fit to mark them, to let him see, that if it was but for purging his Book of these and other such Inadvertancies, it is not improper to advise him to revise it, and give it the other Lick.

HIS Friends also want a few Arguments to convince them of some new Discoveries, Sir *James* has made in *Geography*: As that (g) *Strathern* was in *Galwegia*, or the same with *Gildas's* and *Nenwius's Scythica vallis*: *Gildas*
 B 3 says

says expresly, the *Scots* and *Picts* failed over the *Scythica vallis* in Boats or Corroghs: *Emergunt certatim de Curucis quibus sunt trans Scythicam vallem evecti*: Where then were Sir James's Thoughts, when he said, *What that* (the *Scythica vallis*) *is I do not know, but perhaps it is the Low Country of Strathern*. I believe the Nobility and Gentry of that pleasant Country would rather keep it as it is, than have it turned into Sea.

It will not be easy for Sir James to persuade us that the Town of *Guidi* was situate in *Inchkeith* or *Inchcolm*: It is true, *Bede* (b) says, *Orientalis (sinus maris) habet in medio sui urbem Guidi*; yet every Body but Sir James took the Meaning to be, that it was built on the side of the Firth near to the Middle, where *Buchanan* has placed it. *Inchcolm* has not Room for a Town; and tho' *Inchkeith* be somewhat bigger, yet none in their right Wits could design to build a Town there, for Reasons obvious to the meanest Capacity.

I want also very much to know in what Part of the World was the Country or Town of *Aurelia*, where *Ambrosius Aurelianus* was born, whom Sir James calls always *Ambrose the Aurelian*, Pag. 27, 30, 50, &c. I have indeed read of *Colonia Aurelia* and *Col. Aureliana*, and *Urbs Aurelianensis*, and *Aurelianorum Civitas*, and *Aurelianae Apulae*. But I am afraid none of these will satisfy my Doubt.

SIR

(b) *Eccles. Hist. lib. 1, c. 12.*

SIR *James's* Friends have observed a great many Mistakes he has fallen into, concerning Matters of Ecclesiastical Antiquity: But because I will have Occasion to consider abundance of them, as I proceed in my Answer to the *Vindicator*, I shall only instance here in two Things.

imo, From what Author did Sir *James* learn (i) *That there were but very few Bishops at the Council of Sardica.* *Sulpicius Severus* (k) tells us, *That Constantine* (he ought to have said *Constantius*, at the Desire of his Brother *Constantians*) *commands the Bishops to meet together from all the World to Sardica.* *Socrates* (l) tells us, *That an OEcumemical or general Council was call'd by the Authority of the two Emperours to meet at Sardica*, and that there came to that Town, about 300 western and 76 eastern Bishops. *Sozomen* (m) agrees in the same Number. In the Abstract of the Life of *Paul* Bishop of *Constantinople* (n), and in the Abstract of the Life of *Athanasius* (o) we have the same Account, and in the same Words. *Socrates*, and after him many other Writers cite *Athanasius* himself, who was present at this Council, and restor'd by it to his Bishoprick, as affirming more than 300 Bishops to have met at *Sardica*. But they seem to have

B 4

been

(i) Pag. 82. (k) *Sac. Hist. Lib. 2. Pag. 419. Edit. Hack. res ad Constantinum refertur. Jubet ex toto orbe apud Sardiam Episcopos Congregari* (l) *Lib. 2. Cap. 20.* (m) *Lib. 3. Cap. 12.* (n) *Apud Phot. Bibl. Pag. 775. Grace Augusta vindelicorum, 1501.* (o) *Ibid. Pag. 785.*

been mistaken. All that S. *Athanasius* says, *Apol. 2da. Tom. 1. Pag. 767, 768. Edit. Paris.* is that 344 Bishops subscribed to his being restor'd, some of them before, and others after the Synod, among whom were also *British* Bishops. I will indeed frankly confess, that *Athanasius* (*ad Solitar. vit. Agentes. Pag. 818.*) says expressly, If the Numbers be not vitiated, that there met together from the East and the West at *Sardica*, about 170 Bishops. But granting that we were sure that 90 is the true reading, and suppose we should subtract the 76 eastern Bishops who refused to sit with the rest; yet still we have near an hundred Bishops at the Synod, which one would think no small Number.

SIR *James's* other Mistake in Ecclesiastical History, which I am to take Notice of, is that he would have us to believe, That the Dedication of Churches to the blessed Virgin, and the Saints, was only practised by the *Romanists*, that the ancient *Scots* dedicated only to the holy Trinity, and that this Custom was observed by the *Culdees*, till by the gradual Introduction of foreign *Romish* Doctors, the Religion and Face of the Church came to be changed to the *Romish* Model. I am very sure, if Sir *James* will be at the Pains to consult, but very superficially, the Writings of the ancient Fathers and Ecclesiastic Historians, he will find, that no sooner did *Constantine* encourage and embrace the Christian Religion, but

but stately Churches were dedicated all the Christian World over, to Saints and Martyrs. And what Superstition or Idolatry can there be in consecrating a Church to the Service and Worship of God alone, and calling it by the Name of a Saint, both to preserve the Memory of that Saint, and to distinguish it from other Churches? Those who call this, and the other ancient Customs and religious Rites, by the Name of *Popery*, are not aware what Advantage they thereby give to the *Romish* Church; nor how much harm they often do to the weaker Sort of Enquirers, who finding some Things practised by the primitive Christians, which they had been taught by their Guides, to be popish and superstitious; they are thereby tempted to think, that the real Errors and Corruptions of the *Romish* Church are supported by no less ancient Authority. And yet I am confident there is not one of the *Popish Innovations* that can pretend to be so old, as the Custom of calling Churches by the Names of *Saints* and *Martyrs*. And that Sir *James* may be convinced of this, I shall give a particular List of a great many Churches in the most remarkable Places of the World. It will be needless to mention those at *Rome*; and therefore I shall begin with *Constantinople*,

WHERE we find a Church called the *Church of the Apostles*, as we learn from (p) *Socrates* and

(p) *Lib. 1. Cap. 12. Lib. 6. Cap. 10, 13.*

and (q) *Sozomen*: And both (r) *Eusebius* and (s) *Sozomen* inform us, that *Constantine* was buried in that *Church of the twelve Apostles*. In the same City was also the *Church of St. Paul* (t), the *Church of St. Mary* (u), the *Church of Stephen the Protomartyr* (x) the *Church of St. John Baptist* was seven Miles distant from the City (y), the *Church of Michael the Archangel* at some distance (z), the *Church of Thyrsus the Martyr*, a little from the City, (a).

At *Alexandria*, we read of the *Church of Dionysius* (b), the *Church of Theona* (c), and the *Church of St. John Baptist* (d).

At *Edessa*, there was the *Church of St. Thomas* (e). At *Antioch*, the *Church of St. Ignatius the Martyr* (f). At *Jerusalem* the *Church of the Martyrs* (g), and the *Church of St. Stephen the Protomartyr* (h).

At *Seleucia* the *Church of St. Thecla the Martyr* (i). At *Chalcedon*, the *Church of St. Euphemia the Martyr*, where the general Council of *Chalcedon* sat (k).

At *Carthage*, *Victor Uticensis* mentions the Churches of *Perpetua* and *Felicitas*, of *Celer-*
ma,

(q) *Lib. 8. Cap. 10. & 14.* (r) *de vit. Constant. Lib. 4. Cap. 70.*
 (s) *Lib. 3. Cap. 32.* (t) *Socrat. Lib. 2. Cap. 9.* (u) *Socrat. Lib. 5. Cap. 9.* (v) *Sozom. Lib. 7. Cap. 5.* (x) *Sozom. Lib. 8. Cap. 24.* (y) *Socrat. Lib. 6. Cap. 6.* *Sozom. Lib. 7. Cap. 24.* (z) *Sozom. Lib. 2. Cap. 2.* (a) *Sozom. Lib. 9. Cap. 2.* (b) *Socrat. Lib. 2. Cap. 8.* *Sozom. Lib. 2. Cap. 5.* (c) *Theodoret. Lib. 4. Cap. 22.* *Sozom. Lib. 4. Cap. 8.* (d) *Evag. Lib. 3. Cap. 12.* (e) *Sozom. Lib. 6. Cap. 18.* (f) *Evag. Lib. 1. Cap. 16.* (g) *Euseb. de vita Constant. Lib. 4. Cap. 40.* (h) *Evag. Lib. 2. Cap. 22.* (i) *Evag. Lib. 3. Cap. 8.* (k) *Evag. Lib. 2. Cap. 2, 3.*

ma, of *Scillitanus*, and of *Faustus* (l).

Sulpicius Severus relates, That *Constantius*, when his Army was engag'd with the Usurper *Magnentius* at *Morsa* (or rather *Mursa*), staid in the Church of the Martyrs without the Town, with *Valens* the Bishop of that Place (m). If I had Leisure and Opportunity to turn over the Works of *Athanasius*, *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, *Basil*, *Nazianzen*, *Chrysostom*, &c. I could furnish Sir *James* with a much larger Catalogue: But that which I have given, may satisfy him abundantly.

BUT, what if I shall give sufficient Evidence, that the ancient *Scots* and their Disciples, and even the later *Culdees*, did dedicate Churches to the Saints? We are assured from *Bede*, that those of the *Scotish* Communion consecrated Monasteries and Churches; this is plain from the Practice and Words of Bishop *Cedd* (n). And, What Wonder then can it be, if they followed the Custom not only of their Neighbours, but of the whole Christian World, in calling Churches by the Names of the Saints? We read in *Bede* (o) of the Church of all the Apostles, where *Edelburga* was buried (p); of the Church of St. *Mary*, where *Cedd* was buried; of the Church of

(l) *Hist. Vandal. Persecut.* Paris 1569. 8vo. Lib. 1 Fol. 2, 3, 5, 15, 21, 43. (m) Lib: 2. Cap: 53. *Hist. Sacr.* (n) *Bed: Hist. Eccle:* Lib: 3: Cap: 23. *Dicebat enim hanc esse consuetudinem eorum a quibus normam Discipline dedicerat ut accepta nuper loca ad faciendum monasterium vel ecclesiam, prius orationibus ac jejuniis consecrant.* (o) Lib. 3. Cap. 8. (p) Lib. 3. Cap. 23.

of St. Peter, where King *Oswi*, his Queen *Eaufled*, and their Daughter *Elfleda*, were buried: Nay, we are told of an ancient Church dedicated to St. *Martin*, when the *Romans* were yet in *Britain* (q), and by Consequence long before the coming of *Austin*. *Bede* also tells us, That the *Britons*, after the *Dioclesian* Persecution was ended, founded and built Churches to the Martyrs, *Basilios martyrum fundant, construunt, perficiunt*. Lib. 1. Cap. 8.

AND, Does not Sir *James* say (r), That *Ninian* is rather to be esteemed a Bishop after the Model of the *Picts* and *Scots*, who were converted by him, than in the Way of the *Romish Church*? And yet the same St. *Ninian* (s) built a Church dedicated to St. *Martin*, at *Whittern* in *Galloway*, where he was Bishop. If Sir *James* will believe one of his principal Authors, he must needs grant, that his *Culdees* dedicated Monasteries and Churches to St. *Columba*. Thus *Alexander Miln* expressly says, That the Monastery of *Dunkeld* was dedicated by *Constantine III.* King of the *Picts*, (t) in *Divi Columbæ honorem*. *Fordon*, in

(q) Lib. 1. Cap. 26. (r) Collect. Pag. 74. (s) Lib. 3. Cap. 4. (t) *Scripturum me de vestra sedis initio, oportet primo retexere qualiter Constantinus Pictorum Rex tertius, Divo Columbæ totius tunc regni patrono devotus, monasterium insigne super ripam fluminis Tayensis in locis illis, quæ nunc occupatis, vos reverende pater, pro horto orientali, & vos Alexander, pro mansione de Crief, in ejusdem Divi Columbæ honorem, ad Sancti Adamnani instantiam construxit & dotavit, circa annos Domini septingentos viginti novem. Vitæ Episcoporum Dunkelden: ab Alexandro Miln canonico conscriptæ. Pag. 8. MS. in Bib. Facult. Jurid. Edinensis.*

in some of the MS. Copies, agrees with him. It is no Matter, whether the *Columba*, to whom the Church of *Dunkeld* was dedicated, be the Abbot of *Icolmkill*, or another *Columba*, whom Archbishop *Usher* will have to have been the first Bishop of *Dunkeld*, from the Life of *Cuthbert* Bishop of *Lindiefarn*; for even he, if there was such a Bishop, died about the Year 670. *Brit. Eccl. Antiq.* Pag. 368. *Lond.* 1687.

SIR *James* has been at needless Trouble to bring Charters to prove that Churches were dedicated to the Blessed Trinity; Who did ever deny that? Cannot I prove from Charters and Documents, that Churches were dedicated to the Trinity, after the Extinction of the *Culdees*? And yet, Who would infer from this, that no Churches were dedicated to the Saints after that Time? I might be reckoned very idle, tho' I had the Opportunity, if I should bring Charters, where Churches are mentoned, that were dedicated to the Apostles and Saints, within Sir *James's* Period; because he would, without Doubt, say, it had been done by the *Latinized Scots*. This Mistake of our Author may sufficiently appear by what has been already said; and therefore I proceed to consider the Performance of the *Vindicator*.

C H A P. III.



THE Vindicator giving a short Abstract of the Ecclesiastical Part of the Historical Collections, tells us, That *Sir James hath been at great Pains to make it clear, that our Princes and People did early receive the Christian Faith from the Disciples of St. John, St. Polycarp, St. Anatolius, and other Fathers of the Eastern Church, by Presbyters, without a Bishop.*

THEY commonly say, It is a bad Omen to stumble in the Threshold: It is impossible for me to reconcile those Words to themselves, or to some other Assertions of *Sir James*. *St. Polycarp* was indeed the Disciple of *St. John*; but *Anatolius* was an *Alexandrian*, and taught publicly the *Aristotelian* Philosophy in his native City, till, being of a good Age, he at last left it, and was consecrated a Bishop by *Theotechnus* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Palestine*, and destinated by him to be his Successor; so that he might rather be called the Disciple of *St. Peter* or *St. Mark*, rather than that of *St. John*: But the Chronology will not allow him to have been the Disciple of either; for *Anatolius* flourished about the Year of Christ 270. Again, if the *Scots* received the Christian Faith from the Disciples of *St. John*, and *St. Polycarp*; How could they receive it from *Ana-*

Anatolius? *Polycarp* suffered Martyrdom, *Anno Christi* 147, according to the most learned Bishop *Pearson*; and therefore even his Disciples must have been all dead long before the Year 270. Does not Sir *James* say, that the Conversion of the *Scots* was before *Tertullian's* Time? How then could they receive the Christian Faith from *Anatolius* upwards of 60 Years after the Treatise was written, where the famous Passage is contained?

BUT, pray, Where has Sir *James* made it clear, that the *Scots* received the Faith from the Disciples of St. *John*, *Polycarp*, &c.? The Vindicator affirms (a), That the Writer of the Life does not consider, that Sir *James*, in his Collections, Chapter 4. Page 49. and in the preceding Pages of that Chapter, hath given very good Authority to prove, that the Scottish Church received the Christian Religion very early from St. *John's* Disciples, Fathers of the Greek Church.

I shall not stay, to consider how properly the Church of the lesser or proconsular Asia, on which St. *John* bestow'd his chiefest Care, where he liv'd to a more than ordinary old Age, and where he died, can be reckoned a Part of the Greek Church. I am sure there was as great Difference concerning the Observation of *Easter*, between the Asiatic Churches, in the Days of St. *Polycarp* and many Years afterwards, as was between the Church of
Rome

(a) *Vindicat. of Collect.* Pag. 37.

Rome and the same Churches of the Lesser *Asia*. And if he call them by this Name, because the *Asiatics* used the *Greek* Language, he may, by parity of Reason, call the Kirk of *Scotland* the *English* Church. But tho' this *Peccadillo* may be easily pardoned, yet I am afraid he may not be able to excuse himself, for sending us an *April* Errand: I have with the greatest Attention, again and again read over that 49th Page of the *Collections*, and I challenge any Man to shew me so much as the least Attempt, in that Page, to prove that our Conversion was owing very early to the Disciples of *St. John*. He tells us there, " That
 " the *Britons* were the first Inhabitants of the
 " Island, that embrac'd the Christian Religion;
 " that it is probable the *Scots* and *Picts*, who
 " were next converted, did conform to them
 " in their Religion and Rites; that they for a
 " long Time differ'd from the *Saxons*, who
 " being afterwards converted, submitted to
 " *Rome*; and that the *Britons* in *Bede's* Time
 " were for the most part Enemies of the *Eng-*
 " *lish*, and the whole Catholic Church, as
 " *Bede* calls it, both in the Observation of
 " *Pasch* and other ill Customs. " And there-
 after Sir *James* goes on to consider the Ac-
 counts, that are given of the *Britons* by *Gildas*,
 and *Bede*, that the establish'd Religion among
 the *Scots* may better appear. But we find not
 the smallest Hint, when, or by whom, the
Scots were enlightned with the Knowledge of
 Christ.

Christ. I have with no less Care consider'd the preceding Pages of that 4th Chapter, and I can find as little Satisfaction there; Sir James indeed begins the *Chapter* thus: *The ancient Settlement of the Scots in Britain being proven, our early Conversion to the Christian Faith will be more easily receiv'd, and the Expressions of Tertullian behoved to be applicable to us; and it is easy to think, that the Britons being Christians in the first Century --- and there being several Persecutions by the Romans the first, second and third Centuries, especially in Britain under Dioclesian, the Christian Religion might have been carried the Length of the Scots and Picts living in the same Island, at least before the End of the third Century.* But notwithstanding, I humbly conceive, it might have been as easy for Sir James to have reflected on what he cites, from venerable *Bede*, in the very next Page, *viz.* That the South *Picts* were not converted before the fifth Century, about the Year 412, by St. *Ninian*; and the North *Picts*, not before the sixth Century, in the Year 565. And if the *Scots* were not converted before the *Dioclesian* Persecution, it is impossible, that they received the Christian Faith in, or before Tertullian's Days, or even from Anatolius; for that Persecution began Anno Chr. 303. Sir James goes on, and taxing the Carelessness of *Bede*, for not taking notice of the first Conversion of the *Scots*, he brings a Testimony from him to prove, *that*

Palladius was sent by Pope Celestine to the Scots believing in Christ to be their first Bishop, and cites the *Chronicon Saxonicum* to the same Purpose, and I wonder he omitted *Prosper*, an unquestionable Writer of the Fifth Age, from whom both had it. From thence Sir James justly infers, that the Conversion of the Scots was before the Year of Christ 431: But then he adds, *As to the Time, it must be found out by Inferences from him and other ancient Writers, who if they be of the Roman Communion, will take little Notice of any Conversion of Christians not submitted to the See of Rome.*

ONE would have thought, this had been the proper Place, to prove that our Conversion had been wrought by the Disciples of St. *John*, *Polycarp* and *Anatolius*: But instead of that, we see nothing, but some Shreds from *Bede*, patched together, I do not know how, concerning the Conversion of the North and South *Picts*, and the Plantation of the Christian Faith in the Kingdom of the *Northumbrians*, and other Parts of South Britain, by the *Scottish Bishops* and their Disciples. But we find not the least Insinuation concerning those who planted the Christian Religion amongst the *British Scots*. It is very true, *Bede*, in one of the Passages brought by Sir James, says, That the Northern Province of the Scots and all the *Picts*, in the Time of Bishop *Aidan*, observed *Easter* from the 14th Day of the Paschal Month to the 20th, and pretended that in this they

they follow'd the Writings of *Anatolius*: And Bishop *Colman*, disputing in the Council of *Strenæshalch* or *Whitby*, asserted that the *Scottish* Way of observing *Easter*, was the same which *St. John*, and all the Churches govern'd by him, did observe. Now tho' Sir *James* has not told us, that this was the Argument, by which he had made it clear, that the *Scots* received the Christian Faith from the Disciples of *St. John*, yet it must be this, or none: And the most reverend Archbishop *Spotswood* thought, that some of *St. John's* Disciples, in the Time of the *Domitian* Persecution, were the first Preachers of the Gospel to this Nation, "because (saith he) in the Dispute about *Easter*, our Church did retain the Custom of the Oriental Church, and maintain their Practice by the Authority of *St. John*, from whom they pleaded to have receiv'd the Faith". But that this is no Proof at all, will easily appear by the two following Remarks.

First, The *Scots* might have observed *Easter* as they did, tho' they had been converted by the Disciples of any other Apostle, and therefore their manner of observing *Easter*, can never be a Proof that they receiv'd the Christian Religion from the Disciples of *St. John*. The *Britons*, v. g. us'd the same Cycle of 84 Years, and the same Rules concerning *Easter*, and yet none ever pretended that they were converted by *St. John* or his Disciples. And it is strange that a Presbyterian, of the *Scottish*

Kirk, who holds that the Observation of *Easter* and other such Holy Days is superstitious and unlawful, should argue from a Topick that quite destroys their Principle, namely this, that St. *John* and all the Churches, which were founded by him, and over which he had a particular Inspection, did observe the high Festival of *Easter*, tho' it is very true, they did it not on the same Day with other Churches.

BUT 2^{dly}, Whatever Excuse may be made for Sir *James*, who had fallen into the same Mistake with a great many other learned Men, who thought that the ancient *Scots*, *Picts* and *Britons* observed *Easter* on the Fourteenth Day of the Paschal Moon, whether it was *Sunday* or not, as the ancient Churches of the Lesser *Asia* did: Yet the *Vindicator* cannot but be blamed, who had a full and clear Confutation of that Error laid before his Eyes, in the very Paper which he pretends to answer. There we have two most clear Testimonies from *Bede*, and I could bring other six to the same purpose; but for the sake of Brevity I shall content my self with the earlier Testimony of the Emperor *Constantine the Great*, who, in a Letter that was sent to the *Alexandrians* and to the Bishops that were not present at the Council of *Nice*, affirms, that *Easter* was observ'd after the same manner in *Rome*, and *Africk*, and all *Italy*, *Egypt*, *Spain*, *Gaul*, *Britain*, *Lybia*, all *Greece*, &c. This
Letter

Letter is preserved to us both by (a) *Eusebius*, (b) *Socrates*, and (c) *Theodoret*. If then the *Britons*, *Scots* and *Picts* did not agree with *Polycarp*, and the ancient *Asiatic Churches* in the Observation of *Easter*, neither at the coming of *Austin* into *Britain*, nor even near 300 Years before, how can it be inferred that the *Scots* were converted by the Disciples of *St. John*, *Polycarp*, &c. upon this false and groundless Supposition, that they celebrated that solemn Festival on the same Day with them? And I do sincerely profess, I do not find any other Thing in all *Sir James's Collections*, that is, or can be brought to prove that the *Scots* were converted by the Disciples of *St. John*.

SIR James says, (d) *That there being no Ground to call in Question the short Accounts given of our Ancient Kings, from the Improbabilities and Inconsistencies alledged by Modern Critics, some Credit ought to be given to our own Historians in what they write concerning them.*

Is it not equally reasonable, that we should believe our *Historians* in what they relate concerning the Conversion of our Ancestors to *Christianity*, when nothing can be objected against it, but that the *Scots* were not Inhabitants of *Britain* so early? Now our *Historians* affirm, that *Pope Victor*, at the Entreaty of *King Donald I.* did send to the *Scots* some

C 3

Clergy,

(a) *De Vit. Constan.* lib. 3. c. 18. (b) *Lib. I.* c. 6. (c) *Lib. I.* c. 10. (d) *Hist. Collect.* c. 3. p. 25.

Clergy, who wrought their Conversion about the Year of *Christ* 203, which gave Occasion to that Distich which we have in *Fordon* and *John Major*.

*Christi transactis tribus annis atque ducentis,
Scotia Catholicam cæpit inire fidem.*

It is true, the Chronology does not exactly agree with the Relation. Archbishop *Usher* says, (e) That this Conversion, if it fell out in the Time of Pope *Victor*, must have been in the Year of *Christ* 199 or 200. And according to the most accurate Chronologer *Pagi*, (f) *Victor* died in the Year 197, which, according to the ordinary Reckoning, was the Year 199: But the Mistake of three or four Years can never be enough to invalidate an ancient Account, if no other Objection can be made against it. We are certain of many Things, about the precise Time of which there is great Uncertainty: And the Chronologers differ more about the Year of our blessed Saviour's Nativity. *Tertullian*, (g) amongst the Nations that in his Time were Christians, mentions, *Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita*, which cannot agree to any but the *Scots*. Beside the *Britons*, who were subject at this Time to the *Romans*, there were no other Inhabitants of *Britain*, according to the

(e) *Antiq. Brit.* p. 321. *Lond.* 1687. (f) *Critica in annal. Baronii Tom. I. ad an. 197.* (g) *Advers. Judicof.* c. 7.

the Bishop of St. *Asaph*, except the *Picts*, who, he pretends, about this Time were called only *Caledones* or *Caledonii*; and it is indeed certain, that they never submitted to the *Roman* Yoke: But withal it is as undeniable, that the *South Picts* were not taught the Christian Religion before the Year 412, and that the *North Picts* were converted to Christianity by St. *Colme* and his Twelve Monks, *Anno Christi* 565. Whence it clearly follows, that there must have been another People besides the *Picts*, who were free from the *Roman* Yoke, and at the same time were Christians; and by necessary Consequence the *Scots* were then seated in *Britain*, and professed the Christian Religion before the Year of our Lord 208, when *Tertullian* wrote that Treatise, as is proved sufficiently by Dr. *Alix*, and other learned Antiquaries. Since then we have sufficient Authority for the *Scots* being Christians about the Time assign'd by our Historians, and no Testimony can be brought to prove their Conversion to have been of an ancients Date, it may therefore seem unreasonable to doubt about the Time, or the other Circumstances of their Conversion, that it was brought about by Missionaries from *Rome*, at the Desire of the King. For my part, I see no Harm in believing or saying so; many learn'd *Protestants* have sufficiently confuted the vain Pretences of the Church of *Rome*, which claims

a Superiority over these Churches, that receiv'd the Christian Faith from thence.

C H A P. IV.

BUT whether the ancient *Scots* were converted by the Disciples of St. *John* or St. *Peter*, by Doctors of the *Eastern* or *Western* Church, I am very confident they could not have learn'd the Principles of our *Scotish Presbyterians* from either of them. No Church in the World was govern'd by a Parity of Church Officers. All the ancient Christians believ'd the Divine Institution of Episcopacy. And except *Aerius*, who for his Pains was ranked amongst *Heretics*, I know none that have led the Dance to our *Presbyterians*, but only the *Popish* Monks and Friars, those Janizaries of the *Roman* Pontiffe, who on all Occasions have endeavour'd to depress the Episcopal Character and Power, in order to aggrandize their Master: A goodly Specimen of this they gave the World in the *Council of Trent*, where they vigorously and warmly oppos'd the *Divine Institution* of Bishops. And *Fordon* the Monk was the first Inventaer of that false and groundless Conceit, *That the ancient Church of the Scots was govern'd without Bishops*; which the learn'd Sir *James Dalrymple* and his *Vindica-*

tor have endeavour'd to support, and defend with Eagerness enough.

THE Writer of Mr. *Sage's* Life has, in my Opinion, sufficiently expos'd and confuted that surprizing Fiction. He has prov'd, that there were Bishops among the *Britons* at the coming of *Austin*; that the *Scots* also had Bishops; that supposing the *Scotish* Bishops in the Letters of *Laurentius*, and *John* the elect Pope, were *Irish* Bishops, yet that this was enough to prove, that the *Scots* in *Britain* had Bishops also, because the *Scots* both here and in *Ireland*, the *Britons*, and the *Picts* agreed in all Things, nay in the very Circumstances of Religion: He has shown, that *Aidan* and his Successors in the Bishoprick of *Lindisfarn* or *Holy-Island* were Bishops, and *Diocesan* Bishops. He hath also made it appear, that three *Diocesan British* Bishops were present at the Council of *Arles*; that there were Bishops in *Britain* about the Time of the Council of *Sardica*; that three *British* Bishops were present at the Council of *Ariminum*, which Sir *James* himself confesses in his *Collections*; and that there was a Bishop of *Scotland* present at a Council in *Rome Anno 721*. Besides other Authorities and Reasons, which may be seen in the *Life*. The Vindicator has wholly pass'd over in Silence the most of these Things; and I am now to consider what Defences he has made against those Topics, which he has been pleas'd to attack.

THE

THE first Authority for Bishops among the Britons, was, that *Bede* (h) informs us, That *Augustin* had a Conference with the Bishops and Doctors of the greatest and nearest Province of the Britons; and that several Bishops and many other most learn'd Men, came to a second Meeting with him. The *Vindicator*, in answer to this, remarks, that *Bede's Words* are not fairly stated: For (saith he) they are, *Interea Augustinus Convocavit ad suum conloquium Episcopos five Doctores proximæ Britonum Provinciæ.* The Writer says, the Conference was held with the Bishops and Doctors--- putting an and for an or, and so perverting *Bede's Words*, plainly to favour a Distinction of Bishops and Doctors, which are there synonymous Terms. The Writer of the *Life* was so fair as to warn his Reader of this Criticism, but thought it unworthy of any to be at Pains to confute it; since the Use of the Words *Episcopus* and *Presbyter* is not confounded in any Writer of that or several Ages preceding it; and none has been more careful than *Bede* to distinguish between them. Besides he thought it the most satisfactory Method, to let *Bede* himself and other ancient Authors explain and confirm the Meaning, by shewing, that there had been amongst the Britons and Scots Bishops, properly so called, Diocesan Bishops, designed from their Diocesses, and who sat, and voted in Councils. And who

(h) *Lib. 2. Chap. 2.*

who is ignorant, that this was the Privilege of Bishops only; Bishops, I say, in the true and proper Sense? But since the *Vindicator* insists as yet upon that frivolous Subterfuge, I must beg leave to add a few Words concerning it.

I hope, Sir *James* and his *Vindicator* will own, that *Bede* was of the *Roman* Communion, and therefore knew the Difference between *Episcopus* and *Presbyter*; and that he would endeavour to write in a Style which could be understood by those who liv'd with him: But if this be granted, then Sir *James's* Argument can have no Force, unless the Conjunction *sive* be always exegetical, or unless it always signify that the two Words, between which it is put, import one and the same Thing, or are Synonymous, in *Bede's* Dialect. Now if he be of that Mind, let him consider what Sense he will make of innumerable Places in *Bede's* Works. I shall instance in a few out of his History,

Imo. If Sir *James's* Criticism holds, then *Bede* used *Viri* & and *Fæminæ. Sacerdotes* and *Ministri*, as synonymous Terms; and believ'd there was no Difference or Distinction between a Man and a Woman; a Priest and a Deacon: For he says (i), *Quin potius permissurum, ut Fidem cultumque suæ Religionis cum omnibus qui secum venissent Viris sive Fæminis,*

(i) *Lib. 2. Chap. 9.*

minis, Sacerdotibus seu Ministris *more Christiano servaret.*

2^{do}, Towns, Villages and Provinces would be all the same (k), *inter civitates sive Villas aut Provincias.* Where *Villa* in *Bede's* Stile signifies a Village.

3^{dly}, The *Romans* and the *Cantuarrians* were one and the same People (l) *juxta morem Romanorum seu Cantuariorum.* But lest Sir *James* should say, that *seu* and *sive* have not the same Signification, tho' the one be nothing but the Contraction of the other, just as *neu* for *neve*, let him look *Lib. 3. Cap. 1. Filii--- Regis Edelfridi apud Scottos sive Pictos exulabant:* Whence he must conclude, That the *Scots* were not a People distinct from the *Picts.*

4^{thly}, There will be no Difference betwixt Honour and Fear (m). Thus *Aidanus nunquam divitibus, Honoris sive Timoris gratia, siqua deliquissent reticebat.*

5^{thly}, *Bede* must have reckoned the Commonality and the Nobles altogether the same. (n) *Nam & ipse Rex & plurimi de plebe sive optimatibus, &c.*

Lastly, He must have believed no Difference between good Angels and Devils (o), *Quod autem codices diversos per bonos sive malos Spiritus sibi vidit offerri.* If these six Instances will not satisfy him, I shall bring six Score to the same Purpose. Whence it may appear,
That

(k) *Lib. 2. Chap. 16.* (l) *Lib. 2. Chap. 20.* (m) *Lib. 3. Cap. 5.* (n) *Lib. 3. Cap. 30.* (o) *Lib. 5. Cap. 14.*

That *Bede's* Words were both fairly stated and interpreted, by translating them, *Bishops* and *Doctors*.

WHAT has been said may also serve to expose Sir *James's* Mistake, when (o) he affirms that *Gildas* used *Episcopus*, *Sacerdos*, *Clericus* and *Presbyter* to signify the same Thing; because *Gildas* has these Words *Episcoporum vel ceterorum Sacerdotum aut Clericorum*: And, *Sacerdotalem Episcopatus vel Presbyterii sedem*. The learned Bishop of St. *Asaph*, now of *Worcester*, who is very well acquainted with the Style of *Gildas* and the contemporary Writers, has concluded the quite contrary; and by *Episcopi* understands *Bishops*, by *ceteri Sacerdotes*, Priests, and by *Clerici*, Deacons. *Gildas* mentions, *Præpositos Ecclesiæ cum Sacerdotibus & Populo*; he distinguishes between them that have only the Name of *Sacerdos* (*tantum Sacerdotale nomen*) and them who have the *Apostolical Dignity* (*Apostolicam Dignitatem*) i. e. Bishops. And he calls *Ignatius* Bishop of *Antioch*, *Sacerdos-summus-potestate*, and expressly mentions the Ecclesiastical Degrees, *Ecclesiasticos Gradus*. What Reason then had Sir *James* to say; *I think strange how that learned Prelate stumbled on his Ecclesiastical Steps and Degrees here, where there is nothing but a plain Level?*

Since Sir *James's* Criticism has not proved that the Bishops at the first Conference were
nothing

nothing but Doctors or Presbyters, far less can he infer from thence that the Seven Bishops in the second Conference were also of the same Degree. But let us examine a little, what else they bring to support their Assertion. *Bede's* Words are, *Venerunt septem Brittonum Episcopi & plures viri Doctissimi, maxime de Nobilissimo eorum Monasterio, quod vocatur lingua Anglorum Bancornaburg, cui, tempore illo Dinooth Abbas præfuisse narratur, &c.* "Can this Writer (says the *Vindicator*) think that *Bede* understood these Seven, whom he calls seven Bishops, and inferior to the Abbot in Order, were Diocefan". But where does *Bede* so much as insinuate that they were subject to the Abbot, and what hinders them to have been Diocefan Bishops? He says, indeed, That very many learned Men, the most Part of whom belonged to that Monastery, did come together with the Seven Bishops to the Conference. And tho' he particularly names the Abbot; but has not given us the Names of the Bishops, yet I think none but the *Vindicator* will infer from thence, that these Bishops were inferior or subject to *Dinooth*. They might have remembred, that *Bede* observes it as a singular and unprecedented Thing in the Abbot of *Hyi*, that even the Bishops of the Province were under his Command; now if *Bede* had believ'd that this Custom had obtained in the Monastery of *Bangor*, and therefore probably in all the other Monasteries of the *Britons*,
how

how could he have thought it singular and surprizing in the Monastery of *Icolmkill*? *Episcopi* is the Word he uses on both Occasions, and if it signifies no more but Presbyters in this Place, what should make it signifie more in the other? And if so, do they not make *Bede* speak great Nonsense: *viz.* The Abbot of *Icolmkill*, tho' only a Presbyter, has Jurisdiction over the Presbyters of the Province that are Members of, or subject, to that Monastery. Ay, *but there were seven Divisions of Monks there, with their Rulers; Septem Portiones cum præpositis five Rectoribus, nulla harum minus quam trecentos Homines haberet: Is it not then very plain, that the seven Bishops were subject to Dinoth the Abbot, and the same with the septem Prepositi or Rectores over the Proportions of the Monks?* Truly, if *Bede* had told us, That these seven Bishops were the Rulers of the seven Colleges of Monks, the *Vindicator* had said something to the Purpose; but since it is not so, he might have argued as strongly from the seven Stars, the seven Days of the Week, or the seven wise Men of *Greece*. And with what Ground does the *Vindicator* pretend, That the 2100 Monks of *Bangor* were all *Presbyters*? He might have allow'd some of them to have been *Deacons*: Nay, if he had been well acquainted with the ancient Constitution of Monasteries, he would have believ'd that the smallest Part of them were in holy Orders. But let us suppose

pose they were all Priests; why must *the seven British Bishops have been without any Presbyters, or at least have had very few subject to them?* Did the *Vindicator* ever see a Bull of Exemption granted to the Monks of *Bangor*, or any *Charter* confirming that *Privilege*? Archbishop *Usher* tells (x) us from a *Welsh MS.* That *Dinoh*, to shew that they owned no Subjection to *Augustine*, among other Arguments, used this: *We are under the Government of the Bishop of Kaerleon upon Uske, who under God is to oversee us, and cause us to keep the Way spiritual:* But granting that Monastery had been exempt from the Jurisdiction of the Bishops, yet it would bewray the greatest Ignorance in Ecclesiastic History, to affirm, that the Monks of these exempt Monasteries could be ordained Priests by any other than a Bishop. If any of these Monks had the Charge of Souls, then they were subject to the Bishops; if not, the Bishops must have had other Presbyters subject to them, who did assist them in the public Offices of Religion, and the Care of Souls. But they urge farther, That *Wales* having now but Four Bishopricks in it, the Bounds seem too narrow for Seven. If the *Vindicator* please, I shall shew him, where there were more than thrice Seven Bishops in a less Country than that of *Wales*: But enough, and too much concerning these trifling Evasions.

THE

(x) *Religion of the ancient Irish. Chap. 10. P. 109.*

THE Second Argument was taken from the Letter of *Laurentius*, *Mellitus* and *Justus*, addressed to the *Scottish* Bishops and Abbots; in which they distinguish *Dagamus* a Bishop, and *Columbanus* an Abbot: And from the Letter of *John* then Elect Pope, directed, *To the most beloved and most holy* Thomianus, Columbanus, Chromanus, Diorianus, and Bathanus, Bishops; *To* Cromanus, Hermanus, Laustianus, Stellanus, and Segianus, Priests; *To* Saranus and the rest of the *Scottish Doctors and Abbots*. Here Sir *James's* *Episcopi sive Doctores* will not do the Business; for Bishops are in this Letter plainly contradistinguished both from Priests, and from Doctors and Abbots. And therefore they fall upon another Shift, by affirming those Letters to have been written to the *Irish Scots* only. But tho' this were true, it will stand them in no Stead, as I shall shew by and by. The Writer of the Life did fairly grant, that *Laurence's* Letter was to the *Scottish* Bishops in *Ireland*: But thought it not amiss to point at Sir *James's* Partiality, who would have the (p) *Hybernia*, into which *Eigfred* King of *Northumberland* sent his Army, to have been the Country of the *British Scots*; and yet, here, he will needs have it to be *Ireland*. Sir *James* and his *Vindicator* own, That the *Roman* Province was often called *Britain*; That the Country of the *Scots* and *Picts* was called an Island by

D Gildas,

(p) Bede Hist. Eccl. Lib. 4. C. 26.

Gildas, *Bede* and *Prosper*; and no Body doubts, but the Country of the *Scots* lies nearer to *South-Britain* than *Ireland* does: And therefore, why might not Sir *James* understand the Country of the *British Scots* by *Hibernia Insula Britannia proxima*, as well as think that *Bede* in the other Place meant the Country of the *British Scots*, when he tells us the Inhabitants had *been always very friendly to the English*; which plainly shews they must have been the *Irish*. But tho' his Adversary yielded *Laurence's* Letter to him, yet he had no Reason to allow that the other was also written to the *Irish Scots* only; and he had good Ground to expostulate with Sir *James*, for joining himself with the *Irish* and *English* Writers, who endeavour to rob us of our ancient Countrymen. Sir *James* was told, that he ought to have proved, and not barely affirmed, that *Thomianus*, *Columbanus*, &c. were *Irish* Bishops: And tho' his *Vindicator* cites the very Words, yet he has not mended the Matter. *Nor is there* (saith he) *any Reason to doubt, that the Pope's Letter was to the Scots in Ireland, seeing it was directed to Thomianus and Columbanus, and Three other Bishops, and to Five Presbyters by Name, and but to One Doctor or Abbot, namely Seranus, and other Scottish Doctors or Abbots in general.* So far as I can understand this Argument, it amounts to no more but this.

John

John addressees his Letter to Five *Scottish* Bishops, and as many *Scotish* Priests ; to *Saranus* and the rest of the *Scottish* Doctors or Abbots : *Ergo* those Five Bishops were *Irish* and not *British Scots*. The next Reason seems more to the Purpose : *It can be with no Probability alledged, that there were Five Diocesan Bishops amongst the Scots in their narrow Bounds in Britain, when we have no Authority from Bede, that there was any One at Icolmkill.* If the *Vindicator* would consult the Writings of the Ancients, or even the present State of the Church, he would not make the Number of Bishoprics in Proportion to the Extent of the Countries. I believe the Diocess of *Glasgow* is five Times larger than that of *Brechin* : And *France* hath near double the Number of Bishoprics, which are in *Spain* and *Portugal* together. Enough has been said, in *Mr. Sage's Life*, to make it probable that there was always a Bishop who had his ordinary Residence in *Icolmkill* : But it will be sufficient, if there were Bishops in *Scotland*, in whatsoever Places they had their Seats. It is no Matter tho' some have thought that the *Scots* anciently had but one Bishop ; Sir *James* knows very well, that all our Historians have agreed in relating Things of a later Date, which yet are now certainly known to be Mistakes. The *Vindicator* in the last Place accuses the Pope of Ignorance in Heraldry : But tho' he has ranked simple Presbyters

byters before Doctors or Abbots, yet I hope this will not prove that *Thomianns*, *Columbanus*, &c. were not Bishops among the *Scots* in *Britain*. And indeed he is in the wrong to the Pope, for he gave the Priests the Precedency, because *Daranus* the Abbot was not in Holy Orders, and for what he knew, there might be other *Scotish* Abbots, who also were not *Presbyters*. This needs not seem strange to the Vindicator, who is so well acquainted with *Bede*. If the Vindicator pleases, I will help him to something that bids fairer than all he hath said. Archbishop *Usher* and the Bishop of St. *Asaph* say, *Thomianus* was then Archbishop of *Armaugh*, *Dimanus* Bishop of *Connor*, and *Baithanus* Bishop of *Clonmacnois*: But yet I remember, if the Vindicator be consistent with himself, he will not believe this, because founded on legendary Stories. Moreover, since they confess they cannot find the Sees of the other two Bishops, I must beg their leave to think that they at least had their Bishoprics in *Scotland*, especially since both *Usher*, St. *Asaph*, and Sir *James* grant that *Segianus* the Priest was the same with *Segenius* Abbot of *Icolmkill*.

But let us suppose, that both the Letters were written to the *Scots* in *Ireland*, and to them only; and that all the Bishops mentioned in the Pope's Letter were *Irish*; yet this would be enough to prove, that the *Scotish* Church in *Britain* was governed also by Bishops; because

cause the *Scotish, Irish, Pictish* and *British* Churches agreeing in Faith, and even in the smallest Circumstances of Religion, the plain Practice & Government of any one of these Churches must determine the Practice & Government of any or all of the other Three, if it chanced to be obscure and controverted. The *Vindicator* replies, *That it is nowhere asserted by Sir James, nor (he believes) owned by any other, that the British Scots agreed with either the Irish Picts or Britons in every Thing; and tho' they might be of the same Principles, yet they might differ in some Points among themselves.* But pray, let them be pleased then to tell us what is the Meaning of that fine Period (r) : *Neither would this infer, that the Scots and Picts being of the same Principles with the Britains, had Bishops as well as they; for the Argument would be as good, that they all being of the same Principles, the British had no Bishops properly so called, as had neither the Scots and Picts.* If Sir James meant by being of the same Principles, no more, but that they agreed in the *Credenda*, or main Articles of Faith; then it is evident, it could neither follow from thence, that the *Scots* had Bishops, because the *Britons* had them; nor, that these wanted them, because there were none amongst the *Scots*. Nay, Sir James expressly says (s), *It being certain, that the Britons were the first Inhabitants of the Island, that*

D 3

em-

(r) *Hist. Collect.* P. 80, 81. (s) P. 49.

embraced the Christian Religion, it is probable, that the Scots and Picts, who were next converted, did conform to them in their Religion and Rites. But it is of no Moment whether Sir James did own it or not : Was it not plainly demonstrated (t), That the *Scots* and *Britons* were so far from differing from one another, that they believed the same Faith with the *Romans* ; and at the coming of *Austin* into *Britain*, and for a long Time thereafter, differed in nothing from the Church of *Rome* itself, but only in the Observation of *Easter*, and a few Rites and Ceremonies ? And since Episcopacy, even by the Confession of the Presbyterians themselves, was the Government of all other Churches in the World, for several Ages, before the Period of Time we are now talking of ; since Episcopacy was believed to be of Divine Institution ; and the Administration of the Sacerdotal Offices was esteemed void and null, when performed by those who had not Episcopal Ordination ; if the *Scotish*, *British*, and *Pictish* Churches had been under a different Government, which is nowhere else to be met with ; would not *Bede* have taken Notice of it ? Would not those of the *Romish* Communion have accused and condemned them rather for that, than for any Rites or Ceremonies ? And yet we find not the least Footstep of their being charged with the Want of Bishops, or with any other material

(t) *Life of Mr. Sage. P. 55, & seq.*

terial Difference. *Augustine* demanded no more from the *British* Bishops, but that they should keep *Easter*, and administer Baptism according to the Custom of the *Romish* Church, and preach the Word of God together with him, *i. e.* own him as their Primate, and the Pope as their Patriarch. He was so far from taxing them for rejecting Episcopacy, that (u) having sent a Priest and a Monk to inform Pope *Gregory* of the Conversion of the *Saxons*, and given them Instructions to desire the Pope's Resolution of several Questions; one of these was, *How he was to carry himself with respect to the Bishops of Gaul and Britain?* To which *Gregory* answered, *That he allowed him no Jurisdiction over the Bishops of Gaul; but that he subjected to him all the British Bishops.* Pope *Honorius*, in his Letter to the *Scots* (v), blames them for nothing, but their uncanonical Observation of *Easter*. *John* the Elect Pope, in his Letter to the *Scotish* Bishops, Priests and Abbots (x), takes Notice of the same only, except that he laments the Revival of *Pelagianism* among them. *Laurentius*, *Melitus*, and *Iustus*, in their Letter to the Bishops and Abbots *per universam Scotiam*, tells them (y), *That when they first came to Britain, they had a great Reverence for the Sanctity both of the Britons and Scots, thinking that they walked according to the Custom*

D 4

of

(u) Bede *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. 1. C. 27. (v) *Lib.* 2. C. 19. (x) *Ibid.* (y) *Lib.* 2. C. 4.

of the Catholic Church: And, that after they had become acquainted with the Britons, they entertained a more favourable Opinion of the Scots than of them; but, by conversing in Britain with Bishop Dagamus, and in Gaul with Abbot Columbanus, they found that the Scots differed in nothing from the Britons.

I might add a great many other Authorities and Reasons to prove, that the Scots and Britons agreed in the smallest Things; but this may suffice, it is so evident, that none can cast his Eyes upon *Bede*, but he must be convinced of it: And therefore the Consequence from it, which the *Vindicator* calls *false and groundless*, must be certain and necessary, viz. That the Scots had Bishops of the same Order and Character with the Irish and British Bishops.

C H A P. V.

BEFORE I proceed to vindicate and enforce the Argument brought from the *Scotish* Bishops of *Lindisfarn* or *Holy Island*, it will be very convenient to enquire what *Bede* understood by the *septentrionalis provincia* Scotorum, so often mention'd by him. Sir James (z) pretends, that the British Scots are called Northern with regard to the Pictish Monasteries there, lying South
of

(z) Collect. pag. 64.

of them, and that the Scots in Ireland subject to the Monastery were called Northern, with respect to the Southern Scots there, who were not under the Power of the Monastery of Hyi: But I cannot see how this is consistent with the Situation and Bounds of the Countries of the Scots and Picts, whether ancient or later, as described by himself. Neither can a Monastery's Jurisdiction enter into the Reason, why a Country is called Northern or Southern, especially when *Bede* tells us, (a) That the Monastery of *Hyi* had not all, but only, almost all the Monasteries of the Northern Scots under their Jurisdiction. I think it very plain, that *Bede* believed that the Scots were settled in *Britain* long before the Year of our Lord 503; that he often comprehends their Country in *Britain*, under the Name of *Scotia*, and themselves under that of *Scots*. And by the *septentrionalis Scotorum Provincia*, he not only means the North of *Ireland*, but the Western *Scotish* Islands, and those Parts of *Britain* that were inhabited by the Scots: And by consequence, *septentrionales Scoti* are the Inhabitants of all or any of these Countries.

1mo. I say, *Bede* believed that the Scots were seated in *Britain* before the Bishop of St. *Asaph's* Period. This is clear from several Passages: as (b) when he reckons the Scots the third Nation that settled in *Britain* after the Britons

(a) *Lib. 3. c. 3.* (b) *Post Britones & Pictos tertiam Scotorum nationem in Pictorum parte recepit, Lib. 1. Cap. 1.*

Britons and *Picts*. Whence it necessarily follows, that they had their Seat in this Country at least before the coming of the *Saxons*, *A. D.* 450. Nay Sir George Mackenzie seems to have had good Reason to infer from this Passage, that they were Inhabitants of *Britain* before the *Romans* fix'd themselves there, that is, before *Julius Cæsar*, or, at least, *Claudius*, invaded this Island.

So again, (c) when he expresses Bishop *Laurence's* Concern not only for the new Church gathered out from among the *English*, but for all the Churches of the *ancient Inhabitants*: He must necessarily comprehend the *British Scots* under the *ancient Inhabitants of Britain*. For it is unquestionable that the *Scots* in *Britain* were Christians in Bishop *Laurence's* Time; and therefore since his Care was extended even to the *Scots* in *Ireland*; it can never be thought that the *Scots* in the same Island with himself would be the only Christians neglected by him. Therefore by the *ancient Inhabitants of Britain* *Bede* must have meant not only the *Britons*, but also the *Picts* and *Scots*; and this he could not have done, unless he had believ'd that the *Scots* had their Seat in *Britain* long before the *Saxons*.

WE have another Proof of this, *Lib.* 1. C. 11. where *Bede* having told, that *An. Dom.* 407
Gra-

(c) Denique (Laurentius) non solum novæ, quæ de Anglis erat collecta, Ecclesia curam gerebat, sed & veterum Britannicæ incolarum, nec non & Scotorum, qui Hyberniam Insulam Britannicæ proximam incolunt, *Lib.* 2. C. 4.

Gratianus usurped in *Britain*; and how *Anno* V. C. 1164, that is, *An. Dom.* 410, the *Romans* left off to reign in *Britain*, he adds *Cap.* 12. *Denique subito duabus gentibus transmarinis vehementer sævis, Scotorum a Circio, Pictorum ab Aquilone multos stupet gemitque per annos, Transmarinas autem dicimus has gentes, non quod extra Britanniam essent posite, sed quia a parte Britonum erant remotæ duobus finibus mari interjacentibus, quorum unus ab orientali mari, alter ab occidentali Britanniae terras longe lateque irrumpit, quamvis ad semivicem pertingere possint.* And *Lib.* 1. C. 14. giving the Reason why the *Saxons* were invited to come to the Aid of the *Britons*, he says, *Initum namque est consilium quid agendum, ubi quærendum esset præsidium ad evitandas vel repellendas tam feras tamque creberrimas gentium Aquiloniarium irruptiones.* From these two Citations it is evident, that *Bede* believ'd, that the *Scots* were fixed in *Britain* before the *Saxons*. In the first Passage he expressly says, that the *Scots* as well as the *Picts* were People inhabiting *Britain*: And, in the other, he calls them both Northern Nations, which cannot agree to the *Irish* in respect of the Country of the *Britons*. The Explication that *Bede* gives us of *Gildas's* Words, which he borrow'd from him in the first Passage, confutes abundantly the Pretences and Shifts of the Bishop of St. *Asaph*, who would fain make the World believe from *Gildas*, that the *Scots* who invaded the

the *Britons* were *Irish Scots*. For *Bede* tells us, they and the *Picts* were transmarine Nations, not because they dwelt without the Island, but only because they were divided from the Land of the *Britons* by two Firths, viz. of *Forth* and *Clyde*. And certainly *Bede* was more capable to know *Gildas's* Meaning, than any that liv'd near 1000 Years after *Bede* wrote. If the *Scots* had fix'd themselves in *Britain* about 150 Years only before his Birth, it is impossible *Bede* could have been ignorant of it; and the Tradition concerning the Settlement of a numerous Colony, must have been certainly known to the most ignorant of the Inhabitants of the same Island for a much longer Tract of Time. Nay there is not the least Force in any Thing which is brought from *Gildas*, *Claudian* or *Prosper*, to convince any unbiass'd Person that the *Scots* were not settled in *Britain* before the coming of the *Saxons*. All that is said concerning the *Scots* by any or all of these Writers agrees very well with the *Scots* in *Britain*, and, if all Circumstances be duly considered, to them only.

THE more I consider the Words of *Eumenius* the Panegyrist, the more I am perswaded *Buchanan* was in the right, who would have *soli Britanni* to be of the Genitive Case, and not the Nominative; and the Words thus constructed agree very well with the Context, notwithstanding what the Bishop of *St. Asaph* pretends to the contrary. For *Cæsar* (saith *Eume*

Eumenius) had several Advantages which *Constantius* had not: (d) Moreover, the Nation (that *Cæsar* overcame) being yet rude, unskillful of War, and used to no other Enemies but the *Picts* and *Irish*, who inhabited the same Island Britain with themselves, and were then half Naked, easily yielded to the Roman Arms and Ensigns; but he whom *Constantius* overcame, having got a Roman Legion of his Side, having stopt some Squadrons of Auxiliaries, having mustred the Gauls that were here on Account of Merchandise, having drawn into his Assistance no small Forces of the barbarous Nations, and having all these Exercised and Trained, it was no such easy Thing to get the Victory over him. And tho' *St. Asaph* says, It is scarce Sense to say the *Irish* of the *British* Soil, and therefore *Buchanan* was wise, the Word *Scots* being more agreeable to his Purpose; yet I would fain ask him, Why it is not as good Sense to say, *soli Britanni Hiberni*, as *soli Britanni Scoti*. He owns, That *Ireland* then was called *Scotia* as well as *Hibernia*, and the Inhabitants had the Name of *Scoti* no less than that of *Hiberni*. It must therefore have been as proper for the Panagyrist to call them *Britanni soli Hibernos*, as *Britanni soli Scotos*, i. e. People seated in *Britain*, who deriv'd their Original from a Colony of the *Irish*.

2dly, *Bede*

(d) *Adhoc natio etiam tunc rudis, & soli Britanni Pictis modo & Hibernis assueta hostibus adhuc seminudis, facile Romanis Armis signisque cesserunt, &c. Paneg. Maximiano.*

2dly, *Bede* often comprehends the Country of the *British Scots* under the Name *Scotia*, and themselves under that of *Scoti*. Thus, for Example, Bishop *Colman* is said by *Bede* (e) to have been sent from *Scotland*: And yet the same Author assures us (f) that he was sent from *Hyi*. Now this could in no Sense be called *Ireland*, since it lies very near to the Continent of *Britain*, and is very remote from *Ireland*. Neither was it Subject to any *Irish* King; but (g) was under the Power of some *British* Prince. *Bede* says it was given to St. *Columba* by *Bridius* King of the North *Picts*. Bishop *Usher* (h) considering that *Hyi* was at a great Distance from the Lands of the *Britons* and *Picts*, inclined to follow the Collector of the *Ulster Annals*, who says it was the Gift of *Conallus* (our Historians except *Fordon* call him *Convallus*) the Son of *Congallus* King of *Dalrieda*, or the *British Scots*. But to whomsoever the Island belonged at the coming of St. *Colm*, it might have been under the Jurisdiction of the *British Scots* in the Time of *Colman*; and tho' it had continued even then under the *Picts*, yet the Argument from it is still good, that *Bede* calls by the Name of *Scotia* the Country of the *British Scots*.

THE venerable *Bede* sometimes indeed mentions the *British Scots* with a Mark of Distinction,

(e) *Missus a Scotia*, Lib. 3. Cap. 25. (f) Lib. 4. Cap. 4. (g) *Quæ quidem insula ad jus quidem Britanniae pertinet, non magna ab ea freto discreta*. *Bede Hist. Eccl. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.* (h) *Brit. Eccle. Antiq. Page. 367.*

tion, (i) *Edan Rex Scottorum, qui Britanniam inhabitant*: And (k) *Oswi Pictorum ac Scottorum gentes, quæ Septentrionales Britanniae partes tenent maxima ex parte Dômuir*. And in like Manner he sometimes speaks of the *Irish Scots* with a Restriction: As (l) *Quo tempore plurima pars Scottorum in Hibernia, & non nulla etiam de Brittonibus in Britannia Rationabile & Ecclesiasticum Paschalis observantiae Tempus, Domino donante, suscepit*. But for the most Part, he understands both the *British* and *Irish Scots*: And, unless this be supposed, *Bede* has been altogether silent concerning the Religion and sacred Rites of the *British Scots*, in many Places, when his Subject necessarily required the mentioning of them; which no Body can think he would, or could have done. Thus, for Example, when (m) he gives an Account of the Dispute concerning *Easter* in the Synod of *Streaneschalch*, he brings in *Wilfred* saying: *Uno ac non diverso temporis ordine geri comperimus, preter hos (Scottos) tantum & obstinationis eorum complices, Pictos dico & Brittones, cum quibus de duabus ultimis oceani insulis, his non totis* (for the southern *Irish* agreed with the *Romanists*) *contra totum orbem stulte pugnant*. Here none in the whole World are said to agree with the *Scotti* in the Observation of *Easter* but only the *Picts* and *Britons*: Now the *British Scots*, beyond all Contraverfy, were Christians long before

(i) *Lib. 1. Cap. 34.* (k) *2. Cap. 5.* (l) *Lib. 5. Cap. 16.* (m) *Lib. 3. Cap. 25.*

before that Time, and did observe *Easter* after the same Manner with the *Picts*, *Britons* and *Irish*: Nay, *Colman* and his Clergy, who managed the Dispute against *Wilfred*, were *British Scots*, having come from *Icolmkill*, therefore it necessarily follows, that by *Scotti*, *Bede* understood both the *Scots* in *Britain* and *Ireland*. And when he distinguishes (n. between *septentrionalis Scottorum Provincia*, and *gentes Scottorum in australibus Hiberniæ insulæ partibus*, it is plain that by the first, he not only means the North of *Ireland*, but the western *Scottish* Islands, and the other Parts of *Britain* inhabited by the *Scots*. For he tells us there, That the northern Province of the *Scots* observed *Easter* contrary to the Custom of the *Roman* Church, whereas the southern Parts of the Island *Ireland*, had learned long before to observe that Festival canonically. And again (o) he says, that King *Oswald* demanded a Bishop from the (northern) Province of the *Scots*, and yet in other Places he says, that Bishop *Aidan* was sent from *Hyi*, which clearly proves that *Hyi* was in the northern Province of the *Scots*.

(n) *Lib. 3. Cap. 3.* (o) *Lib. 3. Cap. 5.*

C H A P. VI.

THAT *Aidan, Finan, Colman, &c.* were properly Bishops and Diocesan Bishops too, was demonstrated by the the plainest and most evident Testimonies and Authorities; and yet such is the Power of Prejudice, that the *Vindicator* says, *The downright contrary is to be inferred from them.* As he has represented the Arguments of his Antagonist with Disadvantage, and set them in a very dark Light, so he hath expressed the Reasons of his own surprising Assertion with so much Obscurity, and thrown them down in so perplexed a Manner, that it will not be easy to understand and distinguish them. However I shall endeavour to reduce them to some Method, and take care not to omit the least Thing, that he seems but to insinuate.

HIS First Reason is this: *Bede (p)* affirms, That *all the Monasteries of the Picts, and almost all these of the northern Scots were subject to the Monastery of Hyi---*, and that this Island was ever wont to have for its Governor an Abbot in Priest's Orders, to whose Jurisdiction both all the Province, and also the very Bishops after an unusual Manner ought to be subject, according to the Example of the first

E Teacher

(p) Lib. 3. Cap. 4.

Teacher who was not a Bishop, but a Monk in Priest's Orders. Now *Aidan* was a Monk of *Hyi*, and was sent (*Missus est*) from this Island by the College of these Monks to instruct the *English* in the Christian Faith: Therefore tho' it be said that he got the Degree of a Bishop, tho' he be called *Episcopus Antistes* and *Pontifex*, yet that could not be understood in a *Diocesan* Sense, he being Ordained and Sent, not Consecrated, as our Author unfairly translates it----. It is plain that as *Segenius* the Abbot who sent *Aidan* was a Presbyter, so behoved the College of Monks who concurred with the Abbot in the Mission to be of the Order of Presbyters, and not *Diocesan Bishops*, otherwise those of lesser Dignity must have been of superior Order to the Abbot, and yet they are reckon'd inferior and assisting to him.

In answer to these Things, I shall, first, shew that the Titles of *Episcopus*, *Antistes* and *Pontifex* are sufficient to prove that *Aidan* was a Bishop.

2dly, That he and his Successors in the Bishopric of *Lindisfarn*, together with the other Bishops that were consecrated by them, performed those Acts which they never did before they were Bishops, and which were never done in that or the preceding Ages by any mere Presbyter.

3dly, That tho' *Aidan* was sent from the Monastery of *Hyi*, yet that he was not consecrated by *Segenius* the Abbot, and those of the

the senior Monks, who were only in Priest's Orders.

4thly, That the great and unusual Power of the Abbot of *Hyi* can have no Influence upon the present Argument. *First*, I say, the Titles of *Episcopus*, *Antistes* and *Pontifex*, are sufficient Proofs that *Aidan* was truly and properly a Bishop. It is uncontroverted, That in the seventh and eighth Centuries, the Office of a Bishop was superior to that of a Priest over all the Christian World, both in the *Greek* and *Latin*, *Eastern* and *Western* Churches, except amongst the *Scots*: And it is as unquestionable, That all the Writers of those Ages, when they use the Word *Episcopus*, do mean by it the highest Order: Neither do any of them distinguish more nicely between *Episcopus* and *Presbyter*, *Bishop* and *Priest* than *Bede* does all along; and I challenge any Man to shew me where he so much as once confounds the Orders. It would be tedious to mention all the Instances he gives of Persons, who were first ordained *Priests*, and afterwards *Bishops*: Even when he speaks of the *English Archbishops*, he very often gives them no other Title but that of *Episcopus*; neither does he call any by the Designation of *Antistes* or *Pontifex*, but these who were properly Bishops. If the *Vindicator* will reply, That *Aidan*, *Finan*, &c. are called so, and yet were no Bishops; this will be plainly a Begging of the Question, and no less can

serve his Purpose but an Instance, where the venerable Author gives these Titles to one that was undoubtedly a simple Presbyter: And this, I am sure, none is able to do. Wherefore since *Aidan* is, I cannot tell how often, designed *Reverendissimus Antistes*, *Pontifex* and *Episcopus*, since he is four Times called *Antistes*, and eight times *Episcopus* in one Chapter, *Lib. 3. Cap. 14*. Since he is called (q) first Bishop of *Lindisfarn*, in relation to one of his Successors *Eata*, who was ordained by *Theodore* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and by Consequence was a proper Diocesan Bishop; it follows necessarily, That *Aidan* must have been reckon'd by *Bede*, a Bishop in the same Sense that he calls *Eata* a Bishop, or *Byrinus*, *Agelbertus*, *Wini*, *Cuthbertus*, &c. who were all of the *Romish* Communion, and were without controversy Diocesan Bishops.

2dly, The *Scottish* Bishops of *Holy-Island*, and those who were educated, and ordained Bishops by them, performed all those Acts, which the Bishops of the *Romish* Communion performed, and which, by the Principles of that and the former Ages, were reserved to Bishops only, and were not done by themselves, before they were advanced to that Degree. They formed Churches, they exercised Authority over the inferior Clergy, they ordained *Bishops*, *Priests* and *Deacons*, they consecrated *Abesses*, they excommunicated Offenders, and commanded Obedience to their

Cen.

(q) *Lib. 4. Cap. 27.*

Cenfures. Thus *Aidan* (r) being judged worthy of the Office of a Bishop, and having received the Degree of a Bishop, was sent to convert the *Northumbrians*: He fixed his Episcopal Seat in *Holy-Island*; there he had his ordinary Residence with his Clergy, there he founded also a Monastery, and (f) the Abbot and his Monks were subject to him, just as the Monasteries in *Kent* were under Archbishop *Augustin*. We find the Presbyters called his Presbyters; we are told in one Place, (t) That when he was invited to Dine with the King, he always took with him one or two of the Clergy: And in another Place, (u) That being to Dine in the Palace, the King was just then returned from Hunting, and remembring that a little before he had rebuked the Bishop for giving to a poor Man a fine Horse, which he had gifted him; the King taking his Sword from his Side, and giving it to one of his Servants, fell down at the Bishop's Feet begging his Pardon: Upon which the good Bishop fell a weeping, and one of his Presbyters, whom according to his Custom he had brought with him, *Presbyter suus*, asked the Reason in the *Scottish* Language. And in like manner Bi-

E 3

shop

(r) *Dignum Episcopatu. Accepto gradu Episcopatus. Lib. 3. Cap. 5.* (f) *Si quidem a Temporibus Antiquis ibidem & Episcopus cum clero, & Abbas solebat manere cum Monachis, qui tamen & ipsi ad curam Episcopis familiariter pertinebant. Quia nimirum Aidan, qui primus ejus loci Episcopus fuit, cum Monachis illuc & ipse Monachus adveniens, Monachicam in eo Conversationem instituit, quomodo & prius beatus Pater Augustinus in Cantia fecisse noscitur. Lib. 4. Cap. 27.* (t) *Lib. 3. Cap. 5.* (u) *Lib. 3. Cap. 14.*

shop *Colman* is said by *Bede Lib. 3. Cap. 25.* to have come with his Clergy, *cum Clericis suis*, to the Synod at *Whitby*. Bishop *Aidan* redeemed many that had been sold as Slaves, and made them his Disciples, and (v) advanced some of them to Priests Orders. He (x) consecrated *Herin* Abbess, which was an Episcopal Act as much reserved, in those Days, to Bishops, as Ordination or Confirmation.

To *Aidan* succeeded (y) *Finan* in his Bishopric: And (z) in his Stead he received the Degree of Episcopacy. *Peada* (a) King of the *Middle-Angles* was baptized with all his Courtiers and Soldiers by *Finan*; and from this Bishop he got four Priests to instruct and baptize the rest of his Subjects: Afterwards *Druma* a Scotsman, one of these Four, was ordained by *Finan*, Bishop of the *Middle-Angles* and the *Mercians*: For, saith *Bede* (b), *the small Number of Priests made it necessary to set one Bishop over both those Countries.* The same Bishop *Finan* (c) baptized also *Segbert* King of the East Saxons, with all his Attendants; and *Segbert* desiring some Priests might be sent with him into his Kingdom, to instruct and baptize the rest of his People,
Cedd,

(v) *Lib. 3. Cap. 5.* (x) *Quæ prima Fœminarum fertur in Provincia Nordanumbrorum propositum vestemque Sanctimonialis habitus consecrante Aidano Episcopo, suscepisse, Lib. 4. Cap. 23.* (y) *Successit ei in Episcopatu, Lib. 3. C. 17.* (z) *Pro illo gradum Episcopatus acceperat. Lib. 3. C. 25.* (a) *Lib. 3. C. 21.* (b) *Ibid.* (c) *Lib. 3. C. 22.*

Cedd, one of the Four Priests, who had converted the *Middle-Angles*, was ordered, with another Priest, to travel with the King into his Country, where, having converted many to the Christian Faith, *Cedd* returned to *Lindisfarn*, to consult Bishop *Finan*, and receive farther Directions from him: The Bishop being informed of his Success, taking to his Assistance other Two Bishops, ordained him Bishop of the *East-Saxons*. And *Bede* (d) speaking of the same *Cedd*, and his Three Brothers, *Cymbyl*, *Ceulin* and *Ceadda*; says, Two of them (*Cedd* and *Ceadda*) attained to the Honour of the *High Priesthood*, *summi sacerdotii gradu functi sunt* (e), *Cedd* having thus received the Character of a Bishop, returned to his Province; and his Authority being thus enlarged, he proceeded to finish the Work he had begun: Now he formed Churches; now he ordained Priests and Deacons to assist him in preaching and baptizing; which he neither did, nor could have done before, when he was only a Presbyter. Since I am speaking of this excellent Prelate, it will not be amiss to give one remarkable Instance by which he expressed his Episcopal Authority (f). One of King *Segbert's* Courtiers was engaged in an

E 4

un-

(d) *Lib. 3. C. 23.* (e) *Fecit eum Episcopum in gentem orientalium Saxonum vocatis ad se in ministerium ordinationis aliis duobus Episcopis. Qui accepto gradu Episcopatus rediit ad provinciam & majore autoritate captum opus explens, fecit per loca Ecclesias, Presbyteros & Diaconos ordinavit, qui se in verbo fidei & ministerio baptizandi adjuvarent, Lib. 3. C. 22.* (f) *Lib. 3. C. 22.*

unlawful Marriage: The Bishop having used his Admonitions and Commands to no Purpose, at last proceeded to the Sentence of Excommunication against him, and did forbid all under his Pastoral Care to go to his House, or to eat with him. The King despised the Bishop's Command, and, being invited by the Courtier, went to his House, and was entertained by him. As the King was returning, the Bishop met him; at the Sight of whom the King being terrified, he alighted from his Horse, and falling down at the Feet of the Bishop, who was also dismounted by this Time, he begged Pardon for his Offence. The Bishop being angry, touched the King, as he was lying in that Posture, with the Rod which he had in his Hand; and making use of his Episcopal Authority (*Pontificali auctoritate protestans*) bespoke him after this Manner: " I tell thee, because thou wouldst not decline to go to the House of that debauch'd and graceless Man, thou shalt lose thy Life in his House: " Which fell out accordingly. It would be tedious to insist upon *Colman* the third Bishop of *Lindisfarn*, or *Cellach*, and the other Bishops, who were either *Scots*, or consecrated by the *Scots*. Now nothing is more plain, not only from *Bede*, but all the contemporary Writers, than that the supreme Government of the Church, Ordination, &c. were always reserved to the Bishop. And it is impossible for any Man to shew me any Act
of

of Episcopal Power exerted by *Tuda, Eata, Cuthbert, &c.* Bishops of the *Roman* Communion, which was not also exercised by their Predecessors the *Scotish* Bishops of *Holy Island*, and their Disciples, that had been advanced by them to the High Priesthood. And as they were truly and properly Bishops, so they were Dioceſan Bishops. *Aidan, Finan* and *Colman* had for their Dioceſs the whole Kingdom of the *Northumbrians*: *Diurna* and his Succeſſor *Cellach* had under their Jurisdiction both the *Mercians* and *Middle-Angles*: *Cedd* was over the whole Country of the *East Saxons*: And his Brother *Ceadda* was Bishop of *York*.

3dly, *Tho' Aidan* was ſent from the Monastery of *Hyi*, yet he was not ordained or conſecrated Bishop by *Sigenius* the Abbot, and thoſe of the ſenior Monks, who were only in Priests Orders. It is indeed very true, that *Bede* ſays, *Aidan* was ſent from *Hyi*, by the College of Monks, to convert the *Engliſh*, after he had received the Degree of a Bishop (g). *Finan* alſo was ordained and ſent by the Scots. (h) *Colman*, after his Death, was ſent from *Scotland*: (i) He is called a Bishop of, or from, *Scotland*: And, the Scots (k) ſent him Bishop to *Lindisfarn*. All theſe Things are very true: But then their being ſent by the Scots, and by the Monks of *Icolmkill*,

(g) *Lib. 3. C. 25.* (h) *Ibid.* (i) *Lib. 4. C. 4.* (k) *Lib. 3. C. 25.*

kill, will never prove, that those Bishops were consecrated and ordained by the Abbot, and those of his Monks, who were mere Presbyters. King *Segbert*, after his Conversion, entreated King *Oswi* to give him some Doctors or Teachers, who might convert and baptize his Subjects. *Oswi* (1) sending to the Province of the *Middle-Angles*, called to him the Man of God, *Cedd*; and, having given him another Priest for his Assistant, sent them to preach the Gospel to the *East-Saxons*. Now, I hope, the *Vindicator* will not pretend, that King *Oswi* conferred Priests Orders upon *Cedd* and his Collegue, tho' *Bede* says expressly they were sent by him. Nothing was more ordinary than for one Prince to desire the Favour from another, that such a Man should be sent to him to be a Bishop in his Kingdom; but still the Consecration was performed by the Ecclesiastical Governors, who alone did claim, and were invested with that Power.

THE sole Question therefore must be, Who were the *Ordainers* of the Bishops of *Holy Island*? If the *seniores* or *maiores natu*, from whom King *Oswald* demanded a Bishop, were the Lay-Governors, it is certain, they never did, nor could ordain *Aidan*. All they could do, was only so to order Matters, that he might be ordained by such as had Power to confer Episcopal Orders. If they were the Clergy, what hinders some of them to have been

(1) L. 3. C. 22.

been Bishops? Nothing is more plain, than that Bishops have been called *Seniores* by *Tertullian* and others, and *Majores natu* by *Firilian*, or rather *St. Cyprian*, who, as appears by the *Stile*, seems to have translated his Letter. The *Vindicator* has not followed Mr. *Rule*, who cited the Words of *Tertullian*, *Præsident probati quique seniores*, to establish Ruling or Lay-Elders: He hath chosen rather (m) to shelter himself under the Authority of Sir *Peter King*, who brings this as a Proof, that *Presbyters presided in Church Consistories together with the Bishop, and composed the executive Part of the Ecclesiastic Court, from whence it was called the Presbytery*. I never indeed saw that Book; and, tho' it be very highly valued by some of our Presbyterians here, yet I have been assured by very good Judges, that they do not consult the Honour of that learned Lawyer, who make him the Author of it. But whosoever wrote it, I must beg Leave to say, That *Tertullian* (n) in that Place, is not treating of Church Consistories; there he indeed gives an Account of the publick Worship and the Assemblies for Divine Service, in which, he says, *Præsident probati quique seniores*, i. e. the Bishops. No Body that regards his Reputation, and hath ever read *Tertullian* can deny, but the Church was govern'd by Bishops in his Days: And therefore those who presided in the publick Assemblies for Worship must

(m) *Vindicat. P. 26.* (n) *Apolog. C. 39.*

must have been the Bishops. Yet at the same time I will acknowledge, that the Words *pro-bati seniores* may, in a secondary Sense, comprehend the Priests also, who in dependance upon their Bishop, and especially in his Absence, may be justly enough said to preside in the publick Offices of Religion. But this makes nothing for the *Vindicator*, who beats the Air, and fights with a Shadow, when he fancies that his Adversary thought, none but Bishops were amongst the *maiores natu*, or Members of the *Conventus seniorum*, which ordained, and sent *Aidan* to be Bishop of *Lindisfarn*. All he intended by saying, *Seniores was the very Word by which Tertullian designs Bishops*, was to obviate the common Fallacy, that none of the Monks of *Icolmkill* were above the Order of Priests, because they are called *seniores* & *maiores natu*. It is not only highly probable, but seems to me evident, that there were Bishops present at that Meeting, by whom *Aidan* was consecrated.

BEFORE I proceed to prove this, I must first take notice of a mannerly Compliment, which the *Vindicator* bestows upon his Antagonist in these Words. “ *Aidan being ordain-*
 “ *ed and sent, not consecrated, as our Author*
 “ *unfairly translates it. Bede speaking of Ai-*
 “ *dan* (o) says, *Ipsū esse dignū Episcopatu,*
 “ *ipsū ad erudiendos incredulos & indoctos*
 “ *mitti debere decernunt ---- sicque illum ordi-*
 “ *nantes,*

(o) *Lib. 3. C. 5.*

"*nantes, ad prædicandum miserunt.*" The Vindicator is at pains to tell us, *Aidan* was a Priest before, and what then can be the Meaning of this Word *Ordinantes*, but that they consecrated him a Bishop, of which Office they had first declared him worthy. Certainly to ordain a Bishop imports the very same thing that the Consecration of a Bishop signifies: And I can assure the Vindicator, that the Word *Consecrated* was not chosen by his Adversary out of any Design, for there could be none; but only it dropt accidentally from his Pen, as being the most common and ordinary Expression for the Ordination of a Prelate: And why might not any Body both fairly and properly translate the Verb *ordino* to consecrate, especially when *Bede* uses it almost continually, when he gives us an Account of the Consecration of the Bishops and Archbishops, that were of the *Roman* Communion. Does he not say of Archbishop *Augustin*, (p) *Ab Archiepiscopo ejusdem civitatis Archiepiscopus genti Anglorum ordinatus est.* So (q) Archbishop *Augustin* consecrated (*ordinavit*) two Bishops *Mellitus* and *Justus*. He also had (r) consecrated (*ordinaverat*) *Laurentius*. Both Words are made use of sometimes, as (s) when he is speaking of *Honorius's* Consecration: And five or six Instances are to be found *Lib. 3. C. 28.* where

(p) *Lib. 1. C. 27.* (q) *L. 2. C. 3.* (r) *L. 2. C. 4.* (s) *Qui ordinandus venit ad Paulinum, &---Squintus ab Augustino Dorovernenſis Ecclesia consecratus est Antistes. Lib. 2. C. 18.*

where the Words are promiscuously us'd by the venerable Author. Nay for once he expresses himself by *consecro*, he makes use of the other Word six Times at least. It is therefore very strange, that any, who has but look'd superficially into *Bede*, could infer from the Word *Ordino*, by which the Consecration of the Bishops of *Lindisfarn* is express'd; that these were not truly ordain'd Bishops, but only sent as Commissioners or Superintendants by the Monks and Abbots of *Icolmkill*. And it was chiefly to expose the Weakness of this Inference, that I have given my self the Trouble to consider this other ingenious and civil Criticism of our Author.

I come now to the main Question, *viz.* by whom the *Scotish* Bishops of *Lindisfarn* were ordained or consecrated. And first, it seems highly reasonable to think that they were ordain'd by Bishops; because the Power of ordaining Priests, and much more Bishops, by the Principles of that Age, was confin'd to those of the higher Order; neither can our Adversaries themselves deny, but that it was the universal Practice of all the other Churches in the World, for Bishops only to consecrate Bishops. Besides if *Aidan*, *Finan*, &c. had receiv'd their Commission or Mission (call it what ye will) from mere Presbyters, is it to be conceiv'd, that those of the *Roman* Communion would have own'd them as Bishops, and their Episcopal Acts as valid? Certainly they

they would have made more Noise about that, and deservedly too, than about their Rites and Ceremonies, which were different from those of the *Romanists*: And yet nothing like to this can be found. What should make it improbable, that *Aidan* was consecrated by Bishops, if there were at that Time Bishops in the *Northern Province* of the *Scots*, to which King *Oswald* sent for a Bishop, and over which the Abbot and Monks of *Hyi* exercised Jurisdiction?

I have already prov'd, that the Northern Province of the *Scots* contain'd not only the Northern Parts of *Ireland*, but all the Country of the *British Scots*, and Sir *James Dalrymple* is of the same Mind: Now nothing can be more plain, than that there were Bishops in that Northern Province, when *Aidan* was ordained and sent to *Oswald*. This hapned *An. Dom.* 634; for (t) Bishop *Colman*, after the famous Dispute at *Streaneschalch Anno* 664, left *Holy Island* and return'd to *Hyi*; and the Bishopric of the *Scots* in *Northumberland* continued only 30 Years, which, if we substract from 664, it will appear that *Aidan* went to *Lindisfarn Anno* 634. Now we have very good Authority that there were Bishops amongst the Northern *Scots* before, and about that Time. The Letter of *Laurentius, Mellitus* and *Iustus*, was written to the *Scotish* Bishops in the Beginning of, if not before, the Year 610; which

(t) *Lib.* 3. C. 26.

which was the Eighth of the Emperor *Phocas*: For (u) this Year *Mellitus* was at *Rome* after the writing of the Letter. Suppose then, that the Letter was written no sooner than the Beginning of the Year 610; it is evident it was written 24 Years before *Aidan's* Ordination. Now this Letter was address'd to the Bishops and Abbots over all *Scotia*, at the Time when they observed *Easter* and other Rites contrary to the Customs of the *Roman Church*; and *Dagamus* the Bishop, and *Columbanus* the Abbot mentioned in it, carried Things so far, that they refus'd both to communicate and converse with the *Romanists*: Which shews plainly that there were Bishops in both the Provinces of the *Scots*, even before the Southern Parts of *Ireland* conformed to the *Roman Church* (x), which was the Effect of Pope *Honorius's* Letter, and by consequence not at the soonest, before the Year 626.

AGAIN, the Letter of Pope *John IV.* to some *Scotish* Bishops, &c. was written by him, when he was as yet only elect, and therefore *Anno* 640, that is 6 Years after *Aidan's* Ordination, and 11 before the Consecration of *Finan*: It is clear from the former Citation, and many other Places of *Bede*, that the Southern *Scots* had embrac'd the *Roman Rites* before *Aidan* left *Icolmkill*; and therefore *Thomianus*,

(u) *Lib. 2. C. 4.* (x) *Gentes Scottorum, quæ in austrialibus Hiberniæ partibus morabantur, jamdudum ad admonitionem Apostolicæ sedis antistitis pascha canonico ritu observare didicerunt. L. 3. C. 3.*

nus, Columbanus, Chromanus, Dimanus and *Bathanus*, were Bishops of the Northern Province; whether all of them were in *Ireland* or in *Scotland*, or some of them in the one Country, and some in the other, is not material: They must have been all subject to the Abbot and Monastery of *Hyi*, because Bishops of the Northern Province. And that they belong'd to it, appears from the Letter itself, where *John* regrets that he found some in their Province observed *Easter* not after the manner of the Church: And yet some Years before, all the Southern *Scots* had conform'd to *Rome*. Besides, it is agreed amongst all, that *Segianus* was the same with *Sigenius*, who was Abbot of *Hyi*, when *Aidan* was ordained, and he with *Cromanus, Hermannus, Laustranus* and *Stellanus*, who were all Abbots, are called Priests, to distinguish them from *Saranus*, and the other *Scotish* Abbots that were not in Priests Orders: Now *Segenius* was in the Northern Province, and by consequence all the five Bishops to whom the Pope's Letter is address'd belong'd to the same Province, and were subject to him according to *Bede*. But what needs more? Does not the famous Passage, upon which they found their Fiction, demonstrate that there were Bishops in the Northern Province of the *Scots*, and under the Jurisdiction of the Abbot of *Icolmkill*? *Habere autem solet ipsa insula Rectorem semper Abbatem Presbyterum, cujus juri & omnis provincia, &*
F *ipsi*

ipsi etiam Episcopi, ordine inusitato debeant esse subiecti, &c. Pray, what was the Use of those Bishops, if it was not to perform the Acts of the Episcopal Office, especially those, which, by the Principles of the Catholic Church, and the undoubted Practice of that Age, were reserv'd to Bishops, the Successors of the Apostles? If those Bishops had been nothing but Superintendants, Commissioners or Visitors of the Church, without a regular or formal Consecration; where was the Wonder, that they should be under the Power, and subject to the Jurisdiction of him, or them, whose Delegates they were, and from whom they receiv'd their Commissions? Lay all these Things together; and I hope, it will abundantly appear, that there were proper Bishops in the *Northern Province* of the *Scots*, the Clergy and Monasteries of which were subject to the Monastery of *Hyi*. And therefore who can doubt, since *Oswald* sought a Bishop (y) *from the Province of the Scots*, but that the Bishops were present at the Meeting, where *Aidan* was declared worthy of the Episcopal Dignity and thereafter consecrated?

BUT this is not all, we have positive Evidence, and a plain and direct Proof that the *Scotish* Ordination of Bishops was perform'd by those of the same Order, and not by Priests. *Bede*
(z)

(y) *Lib. 3. C. 5. Cum de Provincia Scotorum Rex Oswaldus postulasset Antistitem.*

(2) says, *That the venerable Bishop Cedd was ordain'd by the Scots*, as he had formerly shown : Now in the Place to which he refers we are assur'd, (a) *That Finan the Scottish Bishop of Lindisfarn made Cedd Bishop of the East Saxons, having taken two other Bishops to assist him in the Consecration.* From which plain and positive Instance it follows necessarily, that the *Scottish* Way of ordaining Bishops was by three Bishops, according to the first Apostolic Canon and the fourth Canon of the Council of *Nice*. And if *Finan* observ'd the canonical Way of consecrating Bishops, what should hinder us to think that he himself and his Predecessor *Aidan* were consecrated at *Hyi* after the same manner? Just so we find that another of the Disciples of the *Scots*, *Ceadda* the Brother of *Cedd*, was consecrated Bishop by *Wini* and two *British* Bishops, who observed *Easter* not according to the *Roman* Way; whence we may see, not only the *Romanists*, but even the *Scots* and *Britons* ordain'd Bishops not by Presbyters, but by those of the highest Order, who alone were believ'd to have that Power.

THE 4th Thing which I undertook to prove was, That the exorbitant and unusual Power of the Abbot and Monks of *Hyi* can have no Influence upon the present Argument. Tho'

F 2

it

(2) *Venerabilis Episcopus Cedda, Jamdudum ordinatus a Scotis, Lib. 3. C. 25. (a) Finanus fecit eum Episcopum in gente orientalium Saxonum, vocatis ad se in ministerium ordinationis aliis duobus Episcopis, Lib. 3. Cap. 22.*

it were certain that *Bede* was not mistaken concerning the great and far extended Jurisdiction of the Abbot; yet still the *Scottish* Bishops, that were under him, might, notwithstanding, be true Bishops; all Ordinations might be perform'd by them, and the Orders which they conferr'd might be justly receiv'd by other Churches as valid and canonical. We have read of Princes who have extended the *Regale* very far, and exercised as great a Jurisdiction over the Bishops within their Dominions, as any Pope, Abbot or College of Monks ever did or could do; and yet so long as the Bishops were allow'd to govern their Clergy, tho' with unwarrantable Restrictions and Limitations; as long as they retained, and exercised the Power of Ordination, and the other necessary and essential Parts of the Episcopal Office, they were truly and properly Bishops, and owned as such by the neighbouring Churches, notwithstanding they were restrain'd from exerting all that Power, which by Divine Institution belong'd to their Order. How far soever the Abbot of *Icolmkill's* Jurisdiction was extended over the Bishops of the Province, yet still they were Bishops, and it left them such; otherwise the celebrated Passage, on which they found their fond Conceit, is downright Nonsense. The Writer of Mr. *Sage's* Life had therefore very good Reason to say, That nothing could be concluded from thence, but that a Bishop, considered as a Monk, or

a Member of that religious House, was to be subject to the Abbot or Superior of the Society. And this was illustrated by a familiar Example. The great Doctor *Fell*, when Bishop of *Oxford*, was also Dean of *Christ's Church*, and thereby became subject to the Jurisdiction of the Vice-Chancellor, tho' only a Priest, and perhaps one of his own Clergy. The Vindicator asks: Were the Bishops of *Lindisfarn* no otherwise subject to the Monastery of *Icolmkill*, than the Head of a College, becoming afterwards a Bishop, must be subject to the Jurisdiction of the Vice-Chancellor? No indeed, for any Thing he, or any Body else knows. But then he goes on with more Questions. " Were they not ordained and sent
 " by the Monastery to be Bishops of that King-
 " dom, and even then subject to the Mona-
 " stery? Will he alledge that any Heads of a
 " College were ever sent, ordained and con-
 " secrated to be a Bishop over any Diocess in
 " *England*, and to continue subject to the
 " Vice-Chancellor and University in that Bi-
 " shoprick? " I shall show that there is no
 Ground for any such Dependance of the Bishops of *Lindisfarn* upon the Monastery of *Icolmkill*; and tho' there had been, yet that, notwithstanding, they would have been true and proper Bishops. Now let us suppose the King of *Prussia* should write to the University of *Oxford* to send him a Bishop, and that they, in a Convocation, should pitch upon a fit Per-
 F 3 son,

son, and desire the Bishop, who is just now the Head of a College, with the Assistance of two other Bishops to consecrate him. Nay let us suppose, that the Jurisdiction of the University extended so far over the Bishops who had receiv'd their Education and Degrees from that famous and learn'd Body, that they were oblig'd to consecrate those whom the University had thought worthy, and that the Bishop thus chosen by the University and consecrated by the Bishops, Doctors of their Society, was bound to receive Instructions from the University in the Administration of his Office; yet even in this Case, the Church of *England* would certainly own that *Prussian* Bishop to be a true Bishop, and his Episcopal Acts to be valid.

BUT why should the Vindicator be angry, that his Antagonist doubted concerning the Truth of this Relation? Was the venerable *Bede* never mistaken? has Sir *James Dalrymple* never dissented from him? Yes indeed, oftner than once. Nay he takes the Freedom (b) boldly to contradict him in a Story which hapned in his own Time. *Neither do we conclude that Bede was mistaken, because it is not certain, but he might have been mistaken.* One Reason why we may doubt concerning this unprecedented and usurped Authority of Monks, is that no other Author takes notice of it either amongst the *Scots* or any other People. We read

(b) *Hist. Collect.* Page 32, 33, 34.

read indeed of some Monasteries, before that Time, exempted from the Jurisdiction of their Bishop; but it can never be shown that they exercised Jurisdiction over their Diocefans. Moreover, it does not appear from all, or any of the Accounts which *Bede* gives us concerning the *Scotish* Bishops of *Lindisfarn*, that the Abbot or Monks of *Hyi* claimed or exercised any Power over them after they were installed. On the contrary they form'd Churches, consecrated Abbesses, ordain'd Bishops, Priests and Deacons, govern'd their Clergy and inflicted Censures, without so much as consulting or receiving Instructions from their pretended Constituents the Abbots and Monks of *Icolmkill*. The *Vindicator* pretends, *they could not expect the ordinary Concurrence of the Abbot and College, because of the Distance*: But we find not any Vestige of the least Concurrence ordinary or extraordinary; and I am sure, the Abbot's Commands might have been transmitted more easily and safely from *Hyi* to *Holy Island*, than from thence to the North of *Ireland*, if we consider the boisterous Sea, and the Uncertainty of the Wind and Waves. Neither can the Dependance of the Bishops be inferred from this, *That they brought Ecclesiastics with them from Hyi, and others came afterwards to assist them in the Conversion of the Saxons*; Whence could they have got them except from *Hyi*? The Country whither they had come was overrun with *Paganism*; and

say that they could have made a Choice, is it not reasonable to think, that they could be better pleas'd with their own Countrymen, Fellow-Monks, Friends and Acquaintances, than with Strangers? As little does it seem to the purpose, *that Ceollach and Colman returned to Hyi, after they left their Bishoprics.* Whither should they go rather than to their own Country and Monastery?

THERE is yet another Argument which the *Vindicator* brings to prove, that *Aidan* was no more than a Presbyter. The *Scots* at the Desire of *Oswald*, had first sent a Presbyter to him, but this Man being of a severe Disposition returned Home unsuccessful, and imputed his want of Success to the Indocility and Untractableness of the *Saxons*. *Aidan*, who was present in the Assembly, made a Return to him, *Tunc ait Aidanus (nam & ipse concilio intererat) ad eum, de quo agebatur, Sacerdotem: Videtur mihi, Frater, quia durior justo indoctis auditoribus fuisti, &c. Quo audito, omnes qui consedebant---, ipsum esse dignum Episcopatu decernunt.* “ From which Text (saith the “ *Vindicator*) it is plain, That the First who “ was sent, albeit he be termed *Antistes*, he “ was but one of the Convention of the Elders, “ that *Aidan* who spake was no more but a “ *Sacerdos* or *Frater*, and a Member of the “ Council; and albeit chosen as worthy to be “ sent, *ut dignus Episcopatu*, yet he was but a “ Presbyter, and chosen for his fitness by the “ Consent

“ Consent of all who sat in the Council, and
 “ is expressed thus, *Omnium qui consedebant &*
 “ *ipsum esse dignum Episcopatu, &c.* which
 “ could be of no other Kind but *Presbyter-*
 “ *tus*, being granted by a Meeting of Presby-
 “ ters properly signified by the Terms, *Con-*
 “ *ventus Seniorum, concilium & confessus om-*
 “ *nium*”. The last Part has been already con-
 futed sufficiently, being nothing but his first
 Argument repeted over again. As to the o-
 ther Part; I say, the First that was sent to
Oswald (whom Archbishop *Spotswood* calls
Cormanus, upon what Authority I know not)
 is no where called *Antistes*, and no where said
 to be ordained a Bishop: Tho’ *Oswald* deman-
 ded a Bishop, yet it might have been thought
 fit to try first the Success by a Missionary, who
 was only a *Presbyter*, as was practis’d at the
 Conversion of the *Middle-Angles* and *Merci-*
ans. But let us suppose he was called *Anti-*
stes: What, I pray you, is in this Text that
 contradicts his being a Bishop? Sure it can be
 nothing else, but that he is designed *Sacerdos*,
 and that *Aidan* addresses him by the Compel-
 lation of *Frater*. Now he must be very little
 acquainted with *Bede’s* Stile, who does not
 know that he as well as all the other ancient
 Writers, use promiscuously the Word *Sacer-*
dos, both for a *Bishop* and a *Presbyter*. And
 what more proper Compellation from one
 Monk to another than *Frater*? Nay, upon the
 Sup-

Supposition of the unprecedented Jurisdiction of the Abbot over the Bishops, *Aidan* could not have given him a more affectionate Title; for that of *Pater* was certainly to be reserved to the *sovereign Abbot*. After all that has been said upon this Subject, why may not one ask these pertinent Questions, which the *Vindicator* is pleased to call *Bantring and Frivolous*? Were not *Aidan*, *Finan* and *Colman* Diocesan Bishops? King *Oswald* having been instructed in the Christian Faith, and baptized by the *Scots*, must needs be supposed to have been as much an Enemy to Episcopacy, and especially Diocesan Episcopacy, as they were: And therefore, how could it enter into his Thoughts to desire a Bishop at all? Or, if this could be accounted for, what could move him to demand a Bishop from those, who he knew had none of that Order among them? And if *Aidan*, a Man of most singular Piety and Conduct, did so far revolt from the Principles and Practices of his Mother Church, as to become a Diocesan Bishop, why did the *Scots*, after his Death, consecrate and send *Finan* to succeed him in the same unlawful Office; and again, after this Bishop's Death, *Colman*? Certainly it is impossible to account for all, or any one of these Things, upon the Supposition, That the *Scots* were Enemies to *Diocesan* Episcopacy,

C H A P. VII.

IT having been proved clearly, That the *Scots* had Bishops, and these Diocesan Bishops; it cannot seem improbable that one of them had his Seat at *Icolmkill*, where their famous and toping Monastery was: Especially since we are assured by that Prodigy of Learning the most Pious Archbishop *Usher* (a) from the *Ulster Annals*, that Saint *Columba* the Founder and Abbot of that Monastery, was never without a Bishop, who had his ordinary Residence with him. The *Vindicator* says; *The Archbishop's Authority cannot support the Matter, since there is not so much as one Insinuation, far less a clear Proof from Bede, but only from the legendary Popish Annals of Ulster, written in a dark and ignorant Time.* I think I have made it appear from *Bede* as clearly, that there were *Scotish* Bishops, as that there were *Irish, British, or English.* Nay, it is plain from Sir *James's* darling Citation it self: And not only so, but (b) the Bishop of *St. Asaph* thinks the Meaning of it to be, *that all the Province, i. e. all the Diocese of Hyi, and even the Bishops themselves of that Province or Diocese were subject to the Abbot.* He proves that it is familiar

(a) *Brit. Eccles. Antiq. Pag. 367. Lond. 1687.* (b) *Account of Church Government, Pag. 176, 177, 178.*

miliar with *Bede* to call a Bishop's *Diocese* by the Name of a *Province*; and tho' one *Diocese* can have but one Bishop at a Time, yet it may have many successively; and in this Sense he understands the Place. But whatever be in this, let the Words be taken in the largest Meaning they can bear, yet it will never follow from thence, that there was not a Bishop who ordinarily resided at *Icolmkill*. I acknowledge, the *Ulster Annals* contain many fabulous Things: But I hope all that the legendary Popish Writers relate is not to be rejected as false, else a great deal of Sir *James's* Historical Collections will be supported by little or no Authority. Are there not many Pieces of curious History to be learned from the *Irish Annals*? What does the *Vindicator* think of the (c) Account they give of the first ten Abbots of *Hyi*, and which agrees very well with the ancient Writers? We have Reason not to believe them, when contrary to our Histories, they would rob us of our ancient Kings and Bishops to promote the Honour of their own Country: But they could have no imaginable Design in telling, That St. *Columba* kept always a Bishop, who had his ordinary Residence with him. Neither is there the least Ground to disbelieve this Relation, except the *Monkish* Dream of two or three late Popish Writers, who have asserted that the *Scots* were converted to Christianity, and their Church

(c) *Apud Usher Brit. Antiq. Page 367.*

Church governed by Monks, without Bishops, many Years before *Monkery* was in the World, and much longer still before it reached *Scotland*.

I do also think it very probable, that the Bishop of *Hy* was one of the Six Bishops who subscribed to the Canons of the *Northumbrian* Synod *Anno* 785 or 787. It is certain there were at most but Four *Sees* at that Time in all the *Northumbrian* Kingdom; and the learned *Antiquaries* are of Opinion, that some of the *Scotish* Bishops were present there. Since therefore one of them signs *Adulphus Episcopus Myiensis Ecclesiæ*, and there is no such Place either in *England* or *Scotland*, is it not probable, that the Transcriber has mistaken *Myiensis* for *Hyiensis*, as he has certainly mistaken *Augustadensis* for *Hagulfstaden*? And tho' this Synod was held about 54 Years after *Bede* wrote his History, which he ended *Anno* 731; yet, if there was a Bishop at *Hy* *Anno* 785, it is a great Presumption, that there was also a Bishop there in *Bede's* Time.

THE Argument, that was brought for the Superiority of a Bishop to a Priest, from a Story in the Life of *Columba* written by *Adamnanus*, has so much offended our Author, that no less will satisfy him, but to condemn the Work as spurious. He says, *It is alledged to have been written by Adamnanus*; and again, *It is agreed on all Hands to be a fabulous History, lately published in his Name*. This is new and surprising to me: I am sure,
neither

neither Bishop *Usher*, Dr. *Cave*, *Mabillon*, *Du Pin*, Sir *James Ware*, nor any other *Antiquary* or *Critic*, that I have seen, did ever call it into question, or make any doubt to reckon it the genuin Work of *Adamnanus*; and to reason from it's Authority, whenever they had Occasion. I will be obliged to this learned Gentleman, if he shall be pleased to name me one who has rejected it as spurious. It is very true, this *Author* relates some strange and miraculous Things: But, I think, it cannot be a Law of *Criticism*, that all Books which contain Miracles are to be declared supposititious; else *Bede's* History, some undoubted Works of *Sulpicius Severus*, *Augustine*, *Jerome*, *Athanasius*, and the Writings of many others, could not be owned as genuin. As I will not say but the Ecclesiastical Writers may have been deceived as to some Miracles, which they relate to have been performed in the 4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th Centuries; so I will be very loath to reject all of them as fictitious and legendary. However, there is nothing in this particular Story, but what may be accounted for without any Miracle. “ A
 “ certain Bishop came to *Hyi*, who, being
 “ willing to conceal his Character, and pass
 “ for a Priest only, affecting a more than ordinary Submission and Modesty; *Columba*,
 “ upon the Lord's Day, desired him to assist
 “ him at the Consecration of the Eucharist:
 “ But, when the Stranger came up to the Altar
 “ tar

“ tar to break the holy Bread, as the Custom
 “ of that Place was, and Two Priests were at
 “ Church together; *Columba* looking stedfast-
 “ ly on him, and discovering his Character,
 “ desired him to make use of the Privilege of
 “ his Order, by breaking the Bread alone. ”

For (said he) *now we know that you are a Bishop; Why therefore have you endeavoured to conceal yourself, and hinder us from giving you due Respect and Veneration?* I think, it is no extraordinary Thing, for a Man to discover that another is dissembling, by looking stedfastly into his Face, especially if he had any Suspicion of it before; and it was the most unfit Time and Place that could be, for the Bishop to deny his Character, after *Columba* brought it into question. *But this Story* (says our Author) *seems to be an Invention of the later Popish Times.* Why, I pray you? Is it, because it was forged upon the Practice of the *Romish* Church in these later Times, and agreeably to the Rites thereof? This cannot be; for the quite contrary is true: Tho' I do not doubt but the Church of *Rome* broke the *Holy Bread* at the *Consecration* in the Time of *St. Columba*; yet, it is certain, this Custom, tho' warranted by the Example of our blessed Saviour, has been laid aside in that Church for several Ages bygone. Moreover, the *Vindicator* will have this Story to contradict the Practice of the later *Romanists*, who allow
 one

one Priest to consecrate, and that even in the Presence of a Bishop: And, he says, *The Consecration of the Eucharist is a single Act to be performed by one Person, and a Right common to Presbyters and Bishops*. I hope, he will not pretend, that the ancient Communion Offices did agree with the present Canon of the Mass: And, I will grant, that the Words of Consecration were always pronounced by one Bishop or Priest only; whether the Consecration was performed by *hoc est corpus meum*, as in the present *Romish Missale*; or, by repeating the Words of Institution, after the Conclusion of the *Trisagion* and *Gloria in excelsis*, and some other Prayers, as it was in the ancient *Gallican Church*; or, by a direct Invocation of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the Elements for the holy and great Ends of the blessed Sacrament, together with the Words of Institution, as it is in some ancient and modern Liturgies. Yet, notwithstanding this, I know no Reason why another Priest may not assist the Consecrator, by saying not only the prefatory Prayers, but even some of those that do relate to the main Parts of the Canon. But, whatever may be in this, we have no Need for it at present.

THE Story in *Adamnanus* imports no more, but that, when there were Two Priests present, the one of them assisted in the Consecration only, by breaking the holy Bread together with the consecrating Priest: And tho'

it follows from it, that no Priest concurred with a Bishop in this Action, but he alone broke the Bread; yet we have no Ground to think, that this was not the Custom of the Church of *Icolmkill* in *Columba's* Days, because no such Thing is practised now. How many Rites were used by the Ancients, which are not used in this Age? How many Customs obtained of old in one Church, which were not observed by others. I shall content myself with one Instance.

PREACHING, which seems to be valued by our Presbyterians beyond Prayers and Praises, the proper Acts of Divine Worship, was allowed by the Churches of *Palestine* to *Latics*, as (d) is plain from the Case of *Origen*. If we believe (e) *Sozomen*, and (f) *Cassiodorus*, who was a *Roman*, there was no Preaching at all at *Rome*. And yet, in the *African* Church, that Office was reserved to the Bishops alone: Hence *Optatus Milevitanus* says (g), *Et locutum eum* (*Macarium*, who, as the *Donatists* had complained, had preached) *esse aliquid in populo constat, sed insinuandi alicujus rei causa, non tamen tractandi quod est Episcoporum*; and *Traſtator* with the *Africans* were the same with *ὀμιλῶν* amongst the *Greeks*, and *Traſtatores* the same with *Concionatores*. Might not then the Privilege of breaking the holy Bread be as much reserved to the Bishops in the Church of *Hys*,

G

as

(d) Euseb. *Hist. Lib. 6. C. 19.* (e) *Lib. 7. C. 39.* (f) *Hist. tripart. Lib. 9. C. 39.* (g) *De Schism. Donatist. Lib. 7.*

as Preaching was in the Churches of *Afric*? What Shadow of Reason can there be for disbelieving *Adamnanus*, in relating the Customs of of his own Church? There is no Opposition between *Bede* and him: And, tho' there were a Competition, yet certainly the Authority of *Adamnanus* ought to be preferred to the Authority of *Bede*, in Things relating to *Columba* or *Icolmkill*, where *Adamnanus* sat Abbot 25 Years. *Bede* could know the Customs of the Church of *Hyi* only by Hearsay, and the Information of others: *Adamnanus* was a constant and perpetual Eye-witness of them. *Bede* was born *Anno* 672, Eight Years after the *Scots* left the Bishopric of *Holy-Island*: *Adamnanus* died (h) *Anno* 704, in the 74, or, as others say, in the 80 Year of his Age; and, by Consequence, he was born *Anno* 624, Twelve Years before *Aidan* was sent from *Hyi* to be Bishop of the *Northumbrian Saxons*, and 27 Years after the Death of *Columba*: So that he could not but know these Things better than *Bede*, who published his Ecclesiastical History 27 Years after *Adamnanus*'s Death. And tho' the Vindicator endeavours to lessen his Character, yet it was nothing inferior to that of *Bede* himself. *Ceolfridus*, the Abbot of *Weremouth*, under whom, and in whose Monastery *Bede* was educated, and who was acquainted and conversed with *Adamnanus*, when he was sent Ambassador to
King

(h) Cav. Hist. Lit. Tom. I. Ad annum 679.

King *Alfrid*: This famous Abbot, (I say) in his Letter to *Naitan* King of the *Picts* (i) calls him the excellent Abbot and Priest of *I-colmkill* (*Columbiensium*) and he says, he *discovered wonderful Prudence, Humility and Piety in his Speech and Actions*. Nay, *Bede* himself (k) gives him this excellent Character, *Erat vir bonus & sapiens, & scientia scripturarum nobilissime instructus*. The same Author mentions another pious Monk called *Adamnanus*; but he belonged to the Monastery of *Coldingham*. We have therefore no Reason to doubt concerning the Truth of this remarkable Piece of History; which plainly discovers, that there were Marks of Distinction and Privileges reserved to Bishops, which were denied to Presbyters, and even to the Abbot of *Hyi* himself. And tho' I will not say it proves certainly that the Stranger Bishop was of *Scotland*; yet, I think, it makes it very probable, since Foreigners were obliged to bring commendatory Letters along with them, which always discovered the Character of the Bearer. However, the *Vindicator's* Reason for proving that he might have been a Bishop of the *Irish Scots*, is absolutely a Mistake: For, if he consult *Bede* carefully, he will find, that even the *Southern Irish* had not conformed to the *Romish Rites* in *Columba's* Time, tho' it is certain they did it before *Aidan* was Bishop of *Lindisfarn*.

(i) *Apud Bed. Lib. 5. C. 22.* (k) *Lib. 5. C. 16.*

C H A P. VIII.

H COME now to the other *Paradox* advanc'd by the learned Author of the *Historical Collections*: The Vindicator says, Sir *James* doth not mention how far the *Culdees* publicly profess'd the Christian Faith pure and unspotted from the *Romish* Corruptions, until the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century. *And perhaps* (adds he) *thro' the Severity and Prevalency of the Popish Party establish'd by Authority, they might sometimes be oblig'd to lurk and give some Compliance.* If the Writer of the *Life* has mistaken Sir *James's* Meaning, I am sure, he is not singular; and if what has been said in the *Collections*, not once but often, and in different Places, is to be understood otherwise, it must be in Spight of the common and ordinary Use of Words. And if the *Vindicator* had frankly and candidly affirmed that Sir *James* intended no such Thing, I, in the Name of his Adversary, would have most humbly begg'd his Pardon: But he is so far from this, that he affirms and endeavours to defend what was charged upon our Author, tho' he does but mumble it and seems unwilling to speak it out clearly. Does he not say? (1) " That the Passage Sir *James* " brings from *Alexander Miln*, tho' a little " carped

(1) *Vind.* pag. 35.

“carped at, might serve as a convincing Proof,
 “that the *Culdees*, however they might tem-
 “porize a little, or be Occasional-Conformists
 “in some Things, and at some Times, to the
 “Church of *Rome*, yet they did neither gene-
 “rally own it, nor its Corruptions, else at last
 “they had not been extirpated by that
 “Church.” And again (m) he says, concer-
 ning the Citation from *Richard Prior of Hex-*
ham. Is not the Gloss given by Sir James to
be received, that the Scottish Church did truly
before that Time, generally separate from the
Romish, and were of the same Principles with
these others in Italy itself, France, Germany
and Flanders, who differ'd from that Church,
not in smaller Matters, but in the Doctrine con-
cerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and
other Points of Faith; and erected to them-
selves Churches separate from them. I shall
 therefore proceed to consider what he has said
 upon this Subject. The Writer of the *Life*
 had cited Sir *James*, affirming, That the *Scots*
 had no Regard to the Christian Religion plan-
 ted by *Austin* and his Followers: The Vindi-
 cator says, “He does not fairly represent
 “what Sir *James* said in that 297th Page, which
 “relates to Page 77, where he is not expres-
 “sing his proper Thoughts, but these of *Bede*,
 “*Lib. 2. Cap. 20.* from Pope *Honorius*, and
 “elect Pope *John* his Letter, *Sed nec Religioni*
 “*Christiane, quæ apud eos exorta erat aliquid*
 “*impen-*

“ *impendebat honoris. Quippe cum usque hodie*
 “ *moris sit Britonum, Fidem, Religionemque*
 “ *Anglorum pro nihilo habere neque in aliquo*
 “ *eis magis communicare quam Paganis. Bede*
 “ likewise, *Lib. 2. C. 4.* bringeth another Au-
 “ thority from Archbishop *Lawrence's* Letter,
 “ *Sed cognoscentes Britones, &c.* If this be
 “ wrong said, Sir *James* is not accountable for
 “ it, but the venerable *Bede*, and Popish Arch-
 “ bishop *Lawrence*, and the Popes whom he
 “ cites treating the *Scots* and *Britons* as Puritans,
 “ who would have no manner of Communi-
 “ cation or Commerce with the Latinized *Sa-*
 “ *xons.* ” But how can Sir *James's* Words be
 unfairly represented? Does he not say expressly,
 (n) *The Change which happened in the Third*
Period, that the Latiniz'd Churchmen did not
esteem their Predecessors to have had either true
Faith, Religion, or Church, deserves very well
to be remarked; whereas it has been said in the
first Period, that the Scots had no Regard to
the Christian Religion planted amongst the Sa-
xons by Austin the Romish Missionary and his
Followers, &c. What Sir *James* had said
 could not therefore have been unfairly represent-
 ed, when it was done in his own Words. And
 I wish he and his *Second* had as fairly represent-
 ed the Meaning of *Bede*, of the Popes and
 Archbishop *Lawrence*: I am very sure they
 have quite mistaken it. It is very true, *Bede*
 in the aforecited Place *Lib. 2. Cap. 20.* tells
 us,

(n) *Hist. Collect. pag. 297.*

us, " That *Carduella* King of the *Britons*,
 " altho' a Christian by Name and Profession,
 " exercis'd barbarous Cruelty upon the *Eng-*
 " *lish*, having no Regard to the Christian Re-
 " ligion, which they had embraced; and that
 " the *Britons*, even when he was writing his
 " *History*, altogether despis'd the Faith and
 " Religion of the *English*, and would not
 " Communicate with them in any Thing, no
 " more than if they had been *Pagans*. " But
 then none can justly infer from these Words,
 that the *Britons* had a Religion and Faith dif-
 ferent from the *Saxons*. The Meaning is plainly
 no more but this; tho' both the *Britons* and
Saxons were Christians, and differ'd nothing in
 Religion, but only in some Rites and Customs,
 yet the *Britons* mortally hated the *English*, and
 refus'd to have Communion with them as
 much as they did with *Pagans*. Pope *Victor*
 not only threatned, (as some would soften the
 Matter) but (o) actually excommunicated the
Asiatic Churches, because they observed *Ea-*
ster, as the *Jews* did their Passover, upon the
 14th Day of the Moon; tho' they agreed in
 the Faith as to all Things with him and the
Roman Church at that Time. So the *Nova-*
tians refus'd to communicate with the Catholic
 Church, tho' they differed in nothing at all, but
 in one Point of Discipline. Nay we need not go
 so far back; the present deplorable State of
 the Christian Church may furnish us with too

G 4

many

 (o) Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 5. C. 24.

many Instances, of some who reject the Communion of Churches, with whom they agree in the Matters of Faith. It hath been clearly shown, both in Mr. *Sage's Life*, and here too towards the End of the 4th Chapter, from the Letters of the Popes, and Archbishop *Lawrence*, &c. that the only Reason of the Separation of the *Scots, Irish, Britons* and *Picts* from the *Saxon* Communion was the Difference of some Rites, and that they would not own the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*. What can be plainer than the Words of Archbishop *Augustin* to the *Britons*, (p) *In multis quidem nostræ consuetudini, imo universalis Ecclesiæ contraria geritis: & tamen si in tribus his mihi obtemperare vultis, ut Pascha suo tempore celebretis, ut ministerium Baptizandi, quo Deo renascimur, juxta morem Romanæ sanctæ Ecclesiæ & Apostolicæ Ecclesiæ compleatis, ut genti Anglorum una nobiscum prædicetis verbum Domini, cætera quæ agitis quamvis moribus nostris contraria, æquanimiter cuncta tolerabimus.* Here he tells them that they differed in many Things from the *Roman* Church, but these Things did not concern the Faith; they were only in Rites and Forms of Worship, as appears both from his calling them *nostræ consuetudini*, and *moribus nostris contraria*, and by dispensing and tolerating all their other Customs, providing they only observed *Easter*, and administered Baptism after the manner of the

(p) *Lib. 2. C. 2.*

the *Roman Church*, and join'd with him to preach the Gospel to the *English*, that is, own'd him for their Archbishop, and by consequence the Bishop of *Rome* for their *Patriarch*. Now the observing of *Easter* according to a certain *Cycle*, and the Administration of Baptism with this or the other Ceremony, did not at all concern the Faith; neither was the Pope's Supremacy an Article of the *Roman Creed* in those Days; for we find the same Pope *Gregory the Great*, who sent *Austin* into *Britain*, condemning the Title of *Universal Bishop* with the greatest Severity and Indignation that can be expressed. *I am* (saith he) *so bold as to affirm, that he who affects and uses the Title of Universal Bishop, has the Pride and Character of Antichrist, and is in some manner his Forerunner, by raising himself thus above the rest of his Order.* Certainly then the other different Customs of the *Britons* which *Augustine* was willing to tolerate, must have been of lesser Moment, and not at all relating to the Faith. The *Gallican Liturgy*, being brought into *Britain* by *Germanus* and *Lupus*, was that which the *Britons* used at the coming of *Austin*; and no doubt they must have had also a different *Rituale* from that of the *Roman Church*: It was no Wonder therefore that their Customs and Rites were in many Things contrary to those of the *Romanists*: And *Augustin* had Authority from Pope *Gregory* to dispense with them; for, as appears from the
Pope's

Pope's Answer to *Austin's* second Question, concerning the different Liturgies and the different Customs of the *Roman* and *Gallican* Church, (q) he is left to his Choice, and is advis'd to select what he thought fit, from the *Roman*, *Gallican*, or any other Church; if he judged it most acceptable to God, and most suitable to the Circumstances of the Place. But the *Vindicator* will not suffer us to believe our own Eyes. *Would the Writer of the Life*, (says he) *suppose that Bede did so flatly contradict himself, or that the Scots and Britons became more averse to the Romish Church in Lawrence's Time, than they had been in the Time of Austin?* But pray you, where has *Bede* said that *Austin* would not have contented himself, if the *Britons* had submitted to the Three aforementioned Conditions? Nay I do not remember any Place in all his History, except this, where he mentions particularly any Difference between the *Roman* Church and the *Scots* and *Britons*, but only *Easter* and the *Tonsure*: He is so far from contradicting himself. Neither do I see how it will follow from this, that the *Scots* and *Britons* became more averse to the *Romish* Church in *Lawrence's* Time than in *Austin's*. The *Scots* would not communicate nor converse with *Lawrence*; and the *Britons*, after they discovered *Austin's* Sentiments, were as little in Love with his Communion or Society: But what tho' this did

(q) *Bede Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. C. 27.*

did follow, must I for that disbelieve what I see asserted by *Bede* in the clearest Words? The Inclinations and Practices of Men are very changeable; and I am sure, I have given one Instance where two *British* Bishops not only conversed, but concurred with a *Saxon* Bishop in a very important Act of Religion, viz. the Consecration of Bishop *Ceadda*. But he asks another Question: *Is it to be thought, because Archbishop Austin propos'd no more at the Conference than these few Things, that therefore there were no greater Differences between them than these? Or that the Romish Archbishop did not intend a greater Conformity after these were yielded, and to oblige them to conform yet further by virtue of the general Concession of owning him as their Archbishop?* I have already proved, that there could be no greater Differences than these few Things; and I could give several good Reasons, why we ought to think that *Austin* would have contented himself with the *Britons* conforming as to them only; But my intended Brevity will not suffer me. I shall only say, if he designed afterwards to press a greater Conformity by virtue of his Archiepiscopal Power, there was no need to insist upon any Conditions at all, but that alone of submitting to him as their *Primate*. But what tho' *Austin* had entertain'd such deceitful Thoughts? Does not the *Vindicator* in the same 28th Page say, that *Bede*, *Lawrence*, and the Popes, treat the
Scots

Scots and *Britons* as *Puritans*? I have often heard that the *Puritans* did not love to be ridden too severely, and that when ever it happens so, they never cease to spurn and kick until they have dismounted their Rider, and thrown him into the Dirt. The *Vindicator*, and not his Adversary, doth indeed *contradict the best Authorities of a venerable Presbyter, Archbishop and Pope*; for, no other Difference is mention'd between the *Scots* and *Romanists* by Archbishop *Lawrence*, Pope *Honorius*, or Pope *John*, except the Business of *Easter*: Only *John* laments the spreading of the *Pelagian* Heresy. And because the Author of the *Life* was necessarily oblig'd to give the Contents of the *Letter*, whether true or false, he must therefore be accused of reflecting upon his ancient Countrymen. It is certain that the *British* and *Irish* were tainted with *Pelagianism*; and what Reason is there to think, that the *Scots* were altogether free from the Contagion of that Heresy, especially when not only *Cælestius*, the prime Disciple of *Pelagius*, was a *Scot*, as some think, but even *Pelagius* himself; which the learn'd Doctor *Mackenzie* has rendred very probable?

It not only appears from innumerable Authorities in *Bede*, that the *Scots* and *Romanists* differed only in some Rites and Customs; but it was also evidently proved by this Argument; The *Culdees* cannot be said to have opposed the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*,
since

since we find the ancient *Scots*, so far agreeing with that Church, that even they entertained a great many Opinions, all which our Presbyterians condemn as Popish; and some of them are rejected by all Protestants: And this they did not only after the Year 716, as the *Vindicator* understands it, but even before they embraced the *Romish* Communion, and conformed in the Matter of *Easter* and the *Tonsure*. It was shown in Mr. *Sage's* Life, That they were for *Episcopacy* and *Diocesan* Episcopacy: That they believ'd *Purgatory*, and that the Souls were delivered out of it before the Day of Judgment, by the alone Prayers and Fastings of the Living, and especially by *Masses*; That they practis'd *private Confession*; They had no leis Regard and Veneration for *Reliques* than the *Romanists* have now; and the **R**elicts of the Apostles were sought for from all Places, and Altars built in honour of them; and they believed that Miracles were done by them: They consecrated Churches, and for this End used *holy Water*, by which they thought also Diseases were cured: Churches were dedicated to the Honour of the blessed Virgin and Apostles: They used holy Oil, by which they believed the Raging of the Sea, and Roaring of the Winds were calmed: They observed *Lent*, and all the *Wednesdays* and *Fridays* most religiously: They erected *Crosses*, and used the transient Sign of the Cross. To these may be added, That they had *Monasteries*,

ries, consecrated *Abbeſſes*, and gave all Reverence and Reſpect to Monks; they bowed their Knees when they entered the Church, they followed *unwritten Traditions*, they had a great Regard to a Biſhop's Bleſſing, their Clergy wore a diſtinguiſhing Garb, and they performed divine Worſhip by a *Liturgy*. I could prove all theſe Things by plain Teſtimonies, were it neceſſary. If then the *Scots* complied with the *Romaniſts* in what our Presbyterians call *Popiſh* Errors (and no doubt ſome of them are ſuch) and no Inſtance can be produced, wherein they differed from them, except ſome Eccleſiaſtic Cuſtoms and Rites; is it not reaſonable to conclude, That they profeſſed the ſame Faith, and believed the ſame Doctrines with the Church of *Rome*? And if it was ſo in the Time when they had different Communion, it muſt have been no leſs ſo, after the Year 716, when the *Scots* laid aſide thoſe Rituals, which occaſion'd the Difference, and became of one and the ſame Communion with the Church of *Rome*. But notwithſtanding this, the *Vindicator* asks: *Will this neceſſarily conclude, that the Scots in every Thing complied with the Romaniſts? When it is certain* Bede, *in the End of his Hiſtory, gives the Scots no ſuch Commendation, but only a negative one, viz. Scoti qui Britanniam incolunt ſuis contenti finibus, nihil contra gentem Anglorum infidiarum moliuntur nec fraudum: Whereas before he had ſaid of the Picts, Fœdus*

pacis

pacis cum gente habet *Anglorum*, & Catholicæ pacis ac veritatis cum universali Ecclesia particeps existere gaudet. This is most admirable Reasoning! Tho' *Bede* in this Place does not express the Conformity of the *Scots* to the *Romish* Church, as he does that of the *Picts*, yet it is enough, if he hath done it elsewhere. He informs us (r), " That the Monks of *Hyi*, with all the Monasteries subject to them, were perswaded to comply with the canonical Observation of *Easter* and the *Romish* Tonsure; and (s) that this was brought about by a wonderful and special Providence, that the *Scots*, who had been well acquainted with the Knowledge of the Divine Will, and had frankly and without Envy communicated the same to the *English*, were afterwards by the *English* brought to the perfect Rule of Living in those Things, which they had not rightly understood before. Whereas on the other Hand, the *Britons*, who refused to communicate to the *English* the Knowledge which they had of the Christian Faith, continue obstinate in their crooked Ways, neglect the Tonsure, and celebrate the Solemnity of Christ's Resurrection without the Fellowship of the Christian

(r) *Lib. 5. Cap. 25. prope initium.* (s) *Ibid. infra, Quod mira divina constat factum dispensatione pietatis, ut quoniam gens illa, quæ noverat scientiam Divina cognitionis, libenter ac sine invidia Populis Anglorum communicare curavit: Ipsa quoque post modum per gentem Anglorum in eis quam minus habuerat, ad perfectam vivendi normam perveniret, &c.*

“ Christian Church; when at the same Time
 “ the *English* do believe and are fully instru-
 “ cted in the Rule of the Catholic Faith. He
 “ goes on thus (t), The Monks of *Hy* em-
 “ braced the Catholic Rites of living by the
 “ Perswasion of *Egbert*, who stayed in the
 “ Island thirteen Years, which he consecrated
 “ to Christ, by enlightning it with a certain
 “ new Blessing, and the *Grace of Ecclesiastical*
 “ *Unity and Peace* “. If all this does not im-
 port a perfect Agreement with the *Roman*
 Church, and a Renunciation of all former Dif-
 ferences, I will despair for ever of understand-
 ing the clearest and plainest Words. Our
 Author says, The Mustering up of Objections
 against the *Scottish* Church, ought more pro-
 perly to be done by a *Romanist*, than by one
 professing himself Protestant. This is not the
 only Time, that he would fain give *Innuendos*,
 as if his Antagonist were a disguised Papist:
 But this Bug-bear will no ways trouble or
 frighten him, I can assure him from certain
 Knowledge, That tho’ he is far from thinking
 every Thing *Popish* which our *Presbyterians*
 call so; yet he is as much displeased with the
 Corruptions of the *Romish* Church as any of
 themselves, and upon more firm and solid
 Principles. None of Candor and Learning
 can

(t) *Ibid.* Susceperunt autem Hyienses Monachi, docente Ecgberto Ri-
 tus vivendi Catholicos-----, mansit autem, vir Domini Ecgbertus,
 Annos 13. in prefata insula, quam ipse, velut nova quadam præ-
 lucente gratia Ecclesiastica Societatis et pacis, Christo consecravit.

can deny, That some of the *Romish* Errors prevailed in the seventh and eighth Centuries, and if the *Scots* embraced them then, what Harm can there be in telling a plain Matter of Fact, or what Advantage can the *Romanists* reap by it? In the Words immediately following, the *Vindicator* is likewise injurious to his Adversary: *The Writer* (says he) *has also the Confidence to alledge, That the Britons, as well as the Scots, did conform to the Romish Church.* This did not a little surprize me; tho' I was confident no such Thing was affirmed, yet I did most carefully read over Mr. *Sage's* Life, to see if there was any unguarded Expression, that might give Occasion to the Mistake. I find indeed these Words (u), *Nothing can be more certain than that the Scots and Britons were altogether of the same Faith and Religion with the Romanists, tho' they had differed from them in some few Rituals, before the Year 716.* But whoever would infer from thence, That all the *Britons* conformed in the Year 716, must be one who resolves to feign Mistakes, when he can find none. The *Scots* and *Britons* differed from the *Romanists* in some Rituals before the Year 716; but they could not both be said to differ after that Year, because in this very Year the *Scots* had conformed, as the Author did show a few Sentences before. And tho' it be most certain that the Generality of the *Britons* conti-

H

nued

(u) Mr. *Sage's* Life, Page. 61.

nued their former Customs, yet *Bede* assures us (v), That a Part of them had conformed at the same Time that *Adamnanus* brought the *Scots* in *Ireland* to the Observation of the *Romish* Rites, which makes the Expression most clear, and removes all Possibility of Mistake.

C H A P. IX.

SIR *James* had been told, That it was strange and surprizing to see so ingenious an Author asserting, That the *Scotish Culdees* continued to oppose the Innovations of the *Romish* Church, even to the Beginning of the fourteenth Century; and shrewdly insinuating, that they were Enemies to Episcopacy it self. The *Vindicator* says, there was no Reason to conclude it strange, since what Sir *James* advances is so well vouch-ed by *Popish Writers and Documents*, which the *Biographer* thinks fit to touch upon, but very slightly.

THEREFORE, before I come to examine the Proofs, which the *Vindicator* hath thought fit to repeat, I shall beg leave to give a Specimen of those Authorities and Documents, by which this *Paradox* is said to be so well vouch-ed:

(v) *Quo tempore plurima pars Scotorum in Hibernia, & nonnulla etiam de Britonibus in Britannia rationabile & Ecclesiasticum paschalis observantiae tempus suscepit.---. Lib. 5. Cap. 16.*

ed: And as the bare mentioning of them will be a sufficient Confutation, so it will discover that the touching slightly upon them, was not to Sir *James's* Dishonour. (a) Pope *John II.* by his Bull for anointing King *Robert Bruce* and his Successors, commands the anointing Bishop to exact from the King an Oath, in which he must swear, *Quod de præfato Regno, & aliis terris suis, suæque ditioni subjectis, universos hereticos ab Ecclesia denotatos, bona Fide pro viribus exterminare studebit, &c.* "Therefore the *Culdees*, tho' the *Culdean* Priory of *Abernethy* was converted, Anno 1272. into a collegiate Church of Canon-Regulars, did in great Numbers continue professing the Faith from these Times, to the Reign of King *Robert Bruce*, separate from the Church of *Rome*". (b) In a Charter of King *William* we have these Words, *Quare firmiter præcipio Balivis meis de Morav. ut ipsi sine Disturbatione faciant Richardo Episcopo & Successoribus, singulis Annis, plenarie & integre, habere prædictam decimam de redditibus meis, &c.* "Whence it is observable the Erection of the Bishopric of *Murray* was much opposed by the Clergy and People". (c) Sir *James* saw a Bull of *Innocent IV.* where it is said: *Nonnulli de clero ut concussis columnis ædificium corruat, adversus pontifices suos, impias ut dicitur inter se Colligationes &*

H 2

Conju-

(a) *Hist. Collect. Præfa. Pag. 51, 52.* (b) *Pref. Pag. 56.* (c) *Pref. Page. 57.*

Conjuraciones innectunt, &c. Quæ quidem ex eo præcipue quod in quibusdam Religiosis & Clericis cooperationis dicuntur habere favorem, &c.

“ This Bull being *Anno* 1251, the next Year
 “ after the Instrument concerning the Con-
 “ troverſy betwixt the *Prior* of *St. Andrew's*
 “ and the *Provost* of the *Culdees*, may inſinu-
 “ ate the Jealouſie the Pope had of the Un-
 “ foundneſs of the *Scotiſh* Nation, by the
 “ Connivance of the Clergy and Monks ”.
 “ (d) In *Andrew Winton's* Time, the *Lollards*
 “ began to appear in *Scotland*, and ſhortly
 “ after this *James Resby* and *Paul Craw*
 “ the *Bohemian* were burnt as ſuch, which
 “ might cauſe *Winton* forbear the Name
 “ and Accounts of the ancient *Culdees*, as
 “ *Fordon* and his *Continuator* did after the
 “ appearing of *Wiclif*. (e) Sir *James Bal-*
 “ *four's* History makes *Maldowinus* the Sixth
 “ Biſhop of *St. Andrew's*, who confirmed a
 “ Donation of his Predeceſſors, of the Patri-
 “ mony of *Portmoach*, to *St. Serf* and the
 “ *Culdees* of *Loch-Leven*. (f) *Brude*, the
 “ laſt King of the *Picts*, gave the Iſland of
 “ *Loch-Leven* *Servano & Keledeis*. ” It ſeems
 this *Pictiſh* King and the *Popiſh* Biſhops of
St. Andrew's were very kind to the *Puritan*
Culdees. “ *Malcolm* the Third and his Queen,
 “ tho' bred in *Popiſh* Countries, and moſt
 “ willing to advance the Intereſt of *Rome*, but
 “ very little able, gave to the *Culdees*, *Villam*
 de

(d) Pag. 124. (e) Pag. 130. (f) Pag. 226.

“ *de Balchriffin*; and, *Edelradus filius Malcol-*
 “ *mi regis iis dedit terras de Ardmore*; and,
 “ because he was under Age, *Alexander* and
 “ *David* his Brothers confirmed his Gift af-
 “ terwards, in the Presence of the Priests of
 “ the *Culdees*, besides others: *Coram Deo om-*
 “ *nipotentis & omnibus Sanctis ----- maledictio*
 “ *Dei omnipotentis & Beatae Mariæ virginis,*
 “ *& omnium Sanctorum.*” The *Culdees* were
 Witnesses to this superstitious Deed; but it was
 no more but a Piece of occasional Conformi-
 ty. “ (g) The Bishops of *Kilrimond* were
 “ no less kind to the *Culdees* than the Royal
 “ Family, as appears by the Grant of Bishop
 “ *Maldeus* to them, of the Church of *Mer-*
 “ *kinch*; and by Bishop *Tudal*, of the Church
 “ *de Sconin*, *pro suffragiis orationum*; and by
 “ Bishop *Modach*, of the Church of *Hurkin-*
 “ *derach.*” But, What means this, *pro suf-*
fragiis orationum? It seems Bishop *Tudal* took
 them for good *Roman Catholics*, and expe-
 cted their Prayers for him after his Death:
 Ay, but he was mistaken; they were true *Scot-*
ish Presbyterians, tho’ they were not so foo-
 lish as to refuse a Gift from an Antichristian
 Prelate, and sometimes were obliged to give
 a little Compliance. Nay, *Robert* Bishop of
St. Andrew’s, who humbled the *Culdees* there,
 and established a Prior and Canons, was, not-
 withstanding, very kind to the Monks of *Mo-*
nimusk (h) *salva iis dimidia carrucata terræ,*

H 3 *quam*

quam habuerunt de donatione Roberti, bonæ memorie, Episcopi Sanctæ Andreae, &c. Sir James pretends, That from the Contract between William Bishop of St. Andrew's and the Culdees of Monimusk, it appears, That the Exercise of their Religion was different from the *Romish*. It is indeed agreed, that they should live in one Communion, after the Manner of the Culdees; but then this is immediately explained: The Meaning is, They were to have *unum oratorium, unum refectorium, & unum dormitorium*, as they then possessed them. (i) Eadmer, a Monk of Canterbury, being elected Bishop of St. Andrew's, thought himself bound in Conscience to assert the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury over the *Scotish* Bishops, and therefore refused to be consecrated by any other. King Alexander being exceedingly incensed with this, and Eadmer having advised with John Bishop of Glasgow and Two Monks of Canterbury, they told him, *Nec sustinebit Rex ut quævis potestas, sine ejus dispositione quicquam in aliquo negotio possit*; And therefore it behoves thee (say the Monks) either to leave the Country *aut perpetuo inter Scotos eorum usus sequendo, contra animæ salutem in opprobrio vitam ducere, i.e.* or to defend the Independency of the Church of Scotland, contrary to the Duty thou owest to the Church of Canterbury. I shall show in Eadmer's History, all

(i) Pag. 312, 313.

all the Atchievements of *Don Quixot*, if Sir *James* will shew me there but a Hint of *Culdees*, or other *Scots* separating from the *Romish* Communion. Let the Vindicator pretend what he will, I know none who did ever reckon it a Fiction, that there were Societies of religious Men in Monasteries and collegiate Churches in *Scotland*, that were called by the Name of *Keledei*: Archbishop *Usher*, the Bishop of *St. Asaph*, and Dr. *Stillingfleet*, did own this. What they esteemed to be an idle Fiction and Monkish Dream, was only, That the Church of *Scotland* had been governed by these *Keledei*, without Bishops. Sir *James* has indeed proved, against these great Men, that the *Scotish Culdees* continued longer than they thought they had: But his best and ancientest Accounts concerning them, are borrowed from the learned Primate, who, besides his Testimonies concerning the *Scotish Culdees*, (as Sir *James* has observed (k)) tells us, That the *Keldees* at *Armagh* in *Ireland*, seemed to have been anciently the *Dean* and *Chapter* of that Church, but were forc'd to give Way to Monks of a later Institution; and they were suffer'd to remain in lower Stations, and continued in that Church, and the Church of *Cluanynish* until the Archbishop's Remembrance. Moreover he says, there were some of them in an Island in *Tipperary* in *Ireland*, and in *Bardsley* a little

Island in *North Wales*: And Mr. *Tanner* informs us, that there were *Culdees* at *St. Peter's* in *York*. Now, I hope, Sir *James* will not contend that those *Irish* and *English Culdees* were *Presbyterians*, and dissented from the Church of *Rome*. I am sure there is as little Ground for affirming the same concerning our *Culdees* in *Scotland*. All the Opposition they made to the Bishop of *St. Andrew's* and others, was only when they endeavour'd to deprive them of their Lands and Privileges, and give them away to Monks of a later Institution.

AND this is clear from the rest of Sir *James's* Instances, as from the Controversy between the *Culdees* of *St. Andrew's* and Bishop *Robert*, about the Erection of the *Priory*: And that between the *Caldees* of *Monimusk* and Bishop *William Malvoisin*: Between the *Culdees* of *St. Andrew's* and *Robertus Burgonensis*: Between the Prior of *St. Andrew's* and *Adam de Mackirwistun*, gerentem se pro præposito Ecclesiæ Sanctæ Mariæ civitatis Sancti Andreae, &c. Where, by the Way, I must observe, the Church of the *Culdees* was dedicated to the *Blessed Virgin*. In like manner there was a Controversy between the *Culdees* and Bishop *William Lamberton* de *Jurisdictione agri*, besides the Debate which they had with him concerning his Election, at which Time they appealed to the Pope himself.

THE *Vindicator* proceeds to observe, "How unfairly the Biographer states the Argument: For he lays it down (says he) as an Axiom,"

"Pag.

“ *Pag. 65.* That all who have the least Ac-
 “ quaintance with History know, that the
 “ *Scots* believ’d the Bishop of *Rome* was Vi-
 “ car of Christ, and supreme visible Head of
 “ the Catholic Church. Having establish’d
 “ this, he thinks it uncontroverted, that Sir
 “ *James* has not brought the least Authority
 “ to prove, that the *Culdees* renounc’d the
 “ Pope’s Authority, and therefore would o-
 “ blige Sir *James* to instance when they did
 “ renounce the Pope’s Authority, and wherein
 “ they differ’d from him. ” I must beg that
 Gentleman’s Pardon to tell him, that the Que-
 stion was stated long before, and it had been
 also prov’d that the *Scots* had renounced all
 their former Differences from the Church of
Rome, and were so far from refusing Com-
 munion therewith, that on the contrary they
 agreed with the *Romanists* even in their Errors:
 This (I say) was done long before any Men-
 tion was made of the *Scots* believing the Bishop
 of *Rome* to be the supreme visible Head of the
 Catholic Church. In answer to the Testimony
 brought from *Richard* Prior of *Hexam*, it was
 said, *That all who had the least Acquaintance*
with History know, that the Scots believed all
the Articles of the Romish Faith, as much when
they seem’d to favour Anacletus II. the Antipope,
as they did after their Submission to Innocent II.
They believ’d that the Bishop of Rome was
Vicar of Christ, and supreme visible Head of
the Catholic Church: And the only Question was,
 whe-

whether of the two Competitors was the lawful and duly elected Pope. The *Vindicator* had therefore been more in the Right, if he had said, that the Argument was concluded, and not stated, by those Words; for they are follow'd by no more than one or two Sentences upon that Subject. And was it not reasonable to ask a particular Instance, wherein the *Scots* differ'd from the *Romish* Church; since it had been shown, that they agreed with her in many Things, which our *Presbyterians* condemn as *superstitious* and *unlawful*? The *Vindicator* thinks it sufficient, that Sir *James* has prov'd the Conversion of the *Scots* was by St. *John's* Disciples, and that the *Britons* (from whom the *Scots* differ'd in nothing material) would not unite with the *Saxons*. But I have made it appear, that the *Scots* were not at all converted by the Disciples of St. *John*. And what is it to the Purpose, tho' they had receiv'd the Faith from them? Eight or Nine Hundred Years may make great Changes in Churches and Kingdoms: The Church of *Rome* was as pure as any Church in the World, when the *Scots* became Christians; and yet all Protestants believe she was corrupted with many Errors before the Fourteenth Century. Tho' Bishop *Colman* after the Conference at *Whitby* return'd home with his Clergy, and did not submit to the *Romish* Church, shall we therefore deny, that in the Year 716 the *Scots* did not conform themselves to the *Romanists*? And

if

if the *Scots* were then *enlightned with the Grace of Ecclesiastical Peace and Unity*, as *Bede* expresseth it; and yet afterwards did separate from the Communion of the *Roman Church*; they may be very properly said to have renounc'd the *Romish* Communion. Perhaps Sir *James's* Meaning (1) was not to apply this Expression of *renouncing the Romish Communion* to the Church of *Scotland*, but only to those in *Italy, France, &c.* who differ'd from the *Romish Church*: But then, I am sure, his Meaning is not to be learn'd from his Words. However, this is of no moment; let us therefore examine now, if the Instances brought by his *Vindicator* from *Popish* Writers, be sufficient to prove that the *Culdees* did separate from the Church of *Rome*.

THE First is from the *Excerpts* of the *Priory of St. Andrew's*, *Quos Keledeos appellat, qui secundum suam æstimationem, & hominum traditionem, magis quam secundum sanctorum statuta patrum, vivebant, sed adhuc similiter vivunt.* And again, *Nec ibi missa celebratur nisi cum Rex vel Episcopus illo advenerat: Kelledei namque in Angulo quodam Ecclesie, quæ modica nimis erat, suum officium, suo more, celebrabant.* Now the first Passage relates not to their Faith, but their Customs only and manner of Living: *They liv'd more according to their own Fancy and Tradition of Men, than according to the Statutes of the Holy Fa-*

(1) *Hist. Collect. Pag. 258.*

Fathers. This is sufficiently explain'd by what we read in the same *Excerpts*: *Simul vivebant, & quædam habebant communia, pauciora scilicet & deteriora, quædam vero propria, plura scilicet & potiora, &c.* i. e. They liv'd together, and had some Things in common, but these were the fewest and the worst; the rest of their Possessions, which were both more in Number and of greater Value, they had in Property, according as they had got them from their Kinsmen, Alliances, or others, any manner of Way. We also find they were married; tho' after they became *Culdees*, they were not allow'd to keep their Wives in their Houses, nor any other Women that might occasion any Suspicion. Thus in the *Excerpts*, *Postquam autem Keledei effecti sunt, non licet eis habere uxores suas in domibus suis, sed nec alias de quibus mala oriatur suspicio.* If we believe *Mili's MS.* concerning the Lives of the Bishops of Dunkeld, they convers'd with their Wives, except when it was their Turn to minister at the Altar.

THERE is another remarkable Passage (m) in the same *Excerpts*, the Meaning of which I take to be this: "That the Offerings at the Altar were divided into Seven Parts, One of

(m) *Personæ nihilominus septem fuerunt oblationes altaris inter se dividendes, quarum septem portionum, unam tantum habebat Episcopus, & hospitale unam, quinque vero reliquæ in quinque ceteros dividebantur, qui nullum omnino altari vel Ecclesiæ impendebant servitium, præterquam quod peregrinos & hospites, cum plures quam sex adventarent, more suo hospitio suscipiebant, sortem mittentes, quis quos, vel quot reciperint. Hospitale sane semper sex, & infra suscipiebat sex.*

“ of which was given to the Bishop, another
 “ to the Hospital, and the other Five to Five
 “ of the *Culdees*, who performed no Service
 “ in the Church or at the Altar; but were
 “ only obliged to entertain Strangers, when
 “ there happened to come more than Six at
 “ a Time; for the Hospital was bound to
 “ provide for that Number, or under it.”

We find, that there were to be Twelve *Culdees* besides the *Rector* at *Monimusk*, by the Agreement between them and *William Malvoisin* Bishop of *St. Andrew's*; and therefore it cannot be thought, that there were only Five *Culdees* at *St. Andrew's*: And since the Church of *St. Mary* there belonged to them, it is evident they must have had Priests amongst them, and Divine Service must have been performed by them. Nay, this seems to be plain from the very Words of the other Passage which the *Vindicator* has cited: And it appears also from what immediately goes before, (n) “ That the *Culdees* were married, and
 had

(n) *Reditus & possessiones proprias habebant, quas cum de vita decederent, uxores eorum quas publice tenebant, filii quoque vel filia propinqui vel generi, inter se dividebant, nihilominus & altaris oblationes, cui non deserviebant quod pueri dicere, si non libuisset eis facere, nec potuit tantum auferri malum, usque ad tempus felicitis memoria Regis Alexandri, sancta Dei Ecclesia specialis amatoris, qui & Ecclesiam Beati Andreæ Apostoli possessionibus & redditibus ampliavit, multisque ac magnis muneribus cumulavit, libertatibus & consuetudinibus quæ sui Regis juris erant, cum regali possessione donavit. Terram etenim, quæ Cursus Aprilis dicitur, quam cum allata fuissent Reliquiæ Beati Andreæ Apostoli, Rex Hungarus, cujus supra mentionem fecimus, Deo & Apostolo Andreæ dederat, & postea oblata fuerat, ex integro restituit, eo nimirum obtentu & conditione, ut in ipsa ecclesia constitueretur religio a Deo deservendum. Non enim erat, qui Beati Apostoli altari deserviret, nec ibi missa celebrabatur, nisi cum Rex vel Episcopus illo adveniret, quod raro contingebat; Keledi namque, in Angulo quodam Ecclesiæ, quæ modica nimis erat, suum officium more suo celebrabant.*

“ had Revenues and Possessions in Property,
 “ which after their Death, were divided amongst
 “ their Wives and Children, or other Relations.
 “ Nay, the Money which some of them had
 “ made from the Offerings of the Altar, at
 “ which they had not served, was distributed
 “ the same way. And this Evil could not be
 “ removed, until the Time of King *Alexander*
 “ I. who endowed the Church of St. *Andrew's*
 “ with Revenues and Possessions, and restored
 “ to it the Lands called *Cursus Apri*, for this
 “ End, and upon this Condition, That the
 “ Worship of God should be performed in
 “ that Church: For there was none that at-
 “ tended upon the Altar of the blessed Apostle,
 “ neither was Mass said there, except when
 “ the King or Bishop came thither, which was
 “ but seldom. For the *Culdees* performed Di-
 “ vine Service after their own manner, in a
 “ certain Corner of their Church, tho' the
 “ Church itself was but very little.” It is no
 Wonder that the later Monks did charge
 the *Culdees* with living contrary to the Statutes
 of the ancient Fathers, when they openly kept
 their Wives, and retained many Things in Pro-
 perty, and left to their Relations not only their
 proper Possessions, but even the Oblations at
 the Altar.

AND lest any should think that their being
 married is an Argument of their Separation
 from the Church of *Rome*, it ought to be con-
 sider'd that many of the *English* Clergy, both
 in

in *Monasteries* and *Cathedrals*, did for a long Time keep *Wives*, and yet at the same time were undoubtedly of the same Faith, and the same Communion with the *Romanists*: And it cost much Pains and much Time before they were forc'd to embrace a Life of *Celibacy*. Thus we find King *Edgar*, at the Instigation of Archbishop *Dunstan*, Bishop *Ethelwald*, and Bishop *Oswald*, ejected the married Clergy out of the *Monasteries* and *Cathedrals*, and plac'd Monks in their stead. The (o) *Saxon Chronicle* tells us, that *Ethelwald* expelled the Clergy out of his Diocese of *Winchester*, because they would not observe any Rule, and he settl'd Monks in their Places. We are inform'd by the same *Chronicle* (p), that King *Edgar* expell'd the Priests out of four *Monasteries* in *Winchester* and planted Monks in them. And *Oswald* is said (q) to have cast out the married Clergy out of no less than 7 *Monasteries* in his Diocese, upon the Death of King *Edgar*, Anno 975. *Elfere* Earl of *Mercia* drove out all the intruding Monks in that Province, and restor'd the married Clergy to their Places and Estates; and many others of the Nobility appear'd for the Secular Clergy, and mov'd for a Rehearing of the Cause. Anno 978,

(o) *Expulit Clericos de eo Episcopatu, quoniam nollent ullam regulam observare, ac constituit ibi monachos, ad An. 963. pag. 117.* (p) *Expulit Eadgerus Rex Presbyteros in Wenteno de antiquo Monasterio, etiamque de novo Monasterio & de Ceortefige & de Middletoun, ad An. 964, pag. 120.* (q) *Eadwer. vit. Oswald. Angl. sacr. par. 2. pag. 200.*

978, this Business was debated in a Council at *Calne*, in which the Cause of the secular Clergy was pleaded by *Beornelm* (r) a *Scotish* Bishop and an eloquent Man, who had been sent for to make their Defence. But to be short, tho' it is certain, that the Monks at last prevailed, and possess'd themselves of the Cathedrals and Monasteries, yet the secular Clergy did continue to marry for many Years, afterwards. Thus for Example, we learn from the *Saxon Chronicle*, *ad Annum* 1129, that *William* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in a Synod at *London*, ordain'd the Archdeacons and Priests to put away their Wives before *St. Andrew's Day*, and that those who refus'd to do it should lose their Churches and Houses, and be for ever afterwards incapable of these Honours: But that the King allow'd the married Clergy to return home, and all of them kept their Wives, by the King's Leave, as they had done before. Others of the *English* Historians say, that the King was brib'd with a great Sum of Money, which he rais'd by granting this Dispensation to the married Clergy. Now none will be so ridiculous as to say, that the *English* Clergy who had Wives were not as much in Communion with the Church of *Rome* as the unmarried, and believ'd the same Faith with both. What should hinder then the *Scotish Culdees* from being of the same Religion and Communion with the *Romish* and *English* Churches, tho' they were mar-

(r) Osburn. *de vit. S. Dunstan. Angl. sacr. par. 2. p. 112.*

married also? Nay it seems to me very plain, that the *English* married Clergy of the Monasteries, and especially the *secular Canons* of the *Cathedrals*, differed in nothing but the Name from our *Culdees*. Both lived in common upon the Church Revenues, yet they were allow'd to keep their private Patrimony to themselves: Neither of them did think themselves bound to Celibacy: Both had Wives and Children, and after their Death, left their Estates to them. And King *Edgar* complain'd no less that the Revenues of the Church were expended by the *secular* Clergy upon Wives, than the *Regular Canons* of the Priory of St. *Andrew's* exclaimed against the *Culdees* for bestowing the Oblations at the Altar upon their Relations. As these were said by the later Monks to *live not according to the Statutes of the Holy Fathers*; so the *secular Canons* were said *not to observe any Rule and to live disorderly*. Neither could less be expected, than that those who had intruded themselves into the Churches and Monasteries of others, would endeavour to justify or excuse their Injustice by throwing Dirt upon the Injured. Hence it is, that we find the *Culdees* accused in these *Excerpts* as very negligent in performing Divine Service; which probably was nothing but a mere Calumny.

AFTER I have attentively consider'd the obscure, imperfect and vitiated Accounts, which we have of the *Culdees* from these *Excerpts*,

I cannot see where they are charg'd with condemning or rejecting the *Mass*. The Meaning of the very Words cited by the *Vindicator* seems to be this. They said *Mass* very seldom, that is, only when the King or Bishop came to their Church: *At other Times they contented themselves with their ordinary Office, or Prayers, which they said after their own manner in a certain Corner of their Church, which was not very large.* These last Words seem to imply, that they made use of a *Breviary* different from what was used afterwards by the *Canon Regulars*, who invaded their Lands and Rights. It is certain there were different *Breviaries* and *Missals* both in *England* and *Ireland*: and why not in *Scotland* also? And this did not at all divide the Communion, all of them being allow'd by the *Romish Church*. *Osmund* Bishop of *Salisbury*, towards the End of the Eleventh Century, drew up the Office *secundum usum Sarum*, which very soon became the Standard of public Devotion over all *England* and *Ireland*. And we are inform'd by Eye-Witnesses, that it appears from the *Records* belonging to the See of *Glasgow*, now at *Paris*, that the Service *secundum usum Sarum* was used in that Diocese in the Time of Pope *Alexander III.* who was advanc'd to the Chair *Anno 1160.* And tho' Archbishop *Spotswood* seems to have believ'd the vulgar Error, that *Edward Longshanks* forc'd the Rites of *Sarum* upon the Church of *Scotland*, yet he hath told

us (f), that *Galfrid Livelance*, who was elected Bishop of *Dunkeld* Anno 1236, and died Anno 1249, reformed the Service of his Church *ad usum* Sarum. Perhaps *Robert* the first Prior who came from *England*, brought with him the *Ordinal secundum usum* Sarum; and because the *Culdees* perform'd Divine Service by some of their old Liturgies, therefore they were said *officium suum more suo celebrasse*. Perhaps also the *Culdees* did not understand very well Church Music, and therefore could not sing Mass, or chant the other Parts of the Service, as the later Monks had learn'd to do: But whatever be the Meaning, it cannot amount to this, that they were of a separate Communion from their King and Bishops, who were unquestionably *Romanists*. If that had been, the Monks would have proclaim'd it plainly and loudly, and King *Alexander* and his Brother *David*, whom the *Vindicator* represents as entirely of the *Romish* Interest, would have been far from restoring to the *Culdees* their old Lands, or bestowing upon them new Gifts. Nay it appears from a *Record* in the *Lawyers* Library, that when the Abbot of *Dumfermling*, Chaplain to the Pope and Chancellor to the King, and the Treasurer of the Church of *Dunkeld*, had met by the Authority of the Pope, to determine the Controversy between the Prior of *St. Andrew's* and his Canons on the one side,

(f) *Hist.* pag. 99.

and *Adam Mackarwistun* Provost of the Church of St. *Mary*, and the other *Culdees* acting as Canons, together with their Vicars, on the other side; the Judges examin'd Witnesses, whether the *Culdees* or their Vicars perform'd Divine Service (*utrum divina celebraverint sic ligati*) to which they were obliged. Whence it seems evident to me, that they were only accus'd of Negligence. If the *Culdees* had thought the Mass a superstitious and unlawful Worship, if they had been *Heretics* or *Schismatics*, would not this have been discover'd by their Enemies long before now? This Inquisition was made by Order of the Pope in the 2d Year of King *Alexander III.* Anno 1250, more than 100 Years both after the Prior and Regular Canons were thrust in upon them, and after (as Sir *James* acknowledges) the Authority of the Pope was own'd by the King, Bishops and Barons of *Scotland*: And it was in the Time of Bishop *David Bewham*, who (as *Spotswood* (t) informs us) kept a severe Hand over the Clergy, especially the Monks and others that lived in Religious Orders, and who in a Synod at *Perth*, Anno 1242, (where the King with divers of the Nobility were present) made many good Constitutions as well for Reformation of Abuses, as for securing of Clergymen in their Possessions and Rights. It was as easy to know then whether the *Culdees* said Mass, as it is for one to know now, whether

(t) *Church Hist.* pag. 43.

ther Divine Worship be perform'd in St. *Giles's* Church by a *Liturgy*, or without one.

I wish the *Vindicator* had both seen and consider'd the *Chartulary* of St. *Andrew's*: I am assur'd, that there is nothing there but what contradicteth his groundless Conceit; and therefore I shall subjoin to the End of this Paper a small Specimen of it, as it was faithfully taken from the MS. and communicated to a worthy and ingenious Friend of mine, by a Gentleman of Distinction, no less remarkable for his great Integrity, Wisdom and Learning, than for the ancient and noble Family, from which he is immediately descended. The Mandate of King *David* can be of no use to him, since it only threatens, that if the *Culdees* would not live peaceably with, and under the Prior and Canons, they should be altogether thrust out. *That the Romish Church was not wont by Violence and Fraud to suppress Religious Societies, agreeing in Principles, and subject to her*, will appear to be a Mistake from what has been said, concerning the *Secular Canons*, and the other married Clergy, that were expell'd from the Cathedrals and Monasteries, by the *Regulars*, in *England*. The same discovers also, That the Account given by *Alexander Miln*, concerning the *Culdees* of *Dunkeld*, cited by Sir *James*, Page 244, can be of no Use in the present Dispute: And tho' the Bishopric and Chapter of *Dunkeld* had been founded upon the Ruin of the

Culdees, yet it no ways doth follow that they were Separatists from the Church of *Rome*. Nay, Sir *James* himself endeavours to prove (u), That the *Culdean* Abbacy continued at *Dunkeld* after the Erection of the Bishopric there, and that tho' the Canons might get into the Cathedral, yet the *Culdees* did retain their other Possessions: As they did at *St. Andrews*, *Brechin*, and perhaps *Dumblain*. Moreover the *Vindicator* cannot but know, that several Instances can be given of Bishoprics founded upon the Revenues of Monasteries; the Monks of which were as much Favourers of the *Romish* Corruptions, as the Bishops that were advanced upon their Ruin.

WE now proceed to the last Authority, which is that of (x) *Richard* Prior of *Hexam*: *Illi* (Scoti) *vero diu a Cifalpina, imo fere ab universa Ecclesia discordantes, exosæ memoriæ Petro Leoni, & Apostasiæ ejus nimium favisse videbantur*. From this Sir *James* had inferred, That the *Scotish* Nation, both Clergy and Laity, had been a long Time in Schism and Discord with the *Cisalpin*, and almost with the universal Church, that is, with the *Romish* Church. It was answered, That this would prove too much, even no less than that not only the *Culdees*, but even King *David* himself, the Bishops, Abbots, Priors and Barons of *Scotland*, of whom *Richard* speaks in that Passage, did separate from the *Romish* Church: Whereas the whole

(u) *Hist. Collect.* Page 247. (x) *De Bello Standard*, Page 324.

whole of the Matter was this; There being two Antipopes *Innocent* II. and *Anacletus* II. the *Scots* favoured the Last, or rather stood neuter and unresolved for some Time; until at last they were brought over to *Innocent's* Side, and owned him as the lawful Pope. Now, unless Sir *James* will contradict his own Collections in very many Instances, he cannot deny, but King *David* the I. the Bishops, Abbots and Priors, not to mention the Laity, believed all the Articles of the *Romish* Faith, as much as when they seemed to favour *Anacletus*, as they did after their Submission to *Innocent*; and as much believed that the Bishop of *Rome* was Vicar of Christ, and supreme visible Head of the Catholic Church: And the only Question was, Whether of the two Competitors was the lawful and duly elected Pope. Nay, tho' there were nothing in History to disprove the surprizing Sense, which Sir *James* and his *Vindicator* put upon the *Prior's* Words; they are sufficient of themselves to confute this *contradictory* Gloss. He says, *That the Scots dissenting for a long Time from the Church on this side the Alps, nay, almost the whole Church, seemed to have favoured too much Peter Leo of hateful Memory, and his Apostacy.* If the *Scots* had disowned the Authority of all Popes, and separated from the Communion of the *Roman* Church, why did he say only, that they were disunited from the *Cisalpin*, and almost the whole Church? In

the Sense of our Authors, they were certainly in Separation from the whole Church: For those in *Italy, France, &c.* who, as Sir *James* says, erected separate Communions, were condemned as *Heretics* by the Church of *Rome*, and therefore they could never be reckoned a Part of the Church by the *Prior*. But does not *Richard* plainly insinuate, That their seeming to favour too much *Peter Leo* was the Reason, why he said, *they had separated from the Cisalpin Church?* *Bernard* the zealous Friend of *Innocent* recounting (y) the Countries that owned him as Pope, mentions no more than *Germany, France, Great-Britain, Jerusalem* and *Spain*; which may shew why the *Prior* could not say, that the *Scots* had divided from the *whole Church*; since *Italy* and other Countries adhered to *Anacletus*. The *Vindicator* replies, *That the Prior could not so severely tax the Scottish Church for a mere Neutrality; nor could this short Neutrality be called diuturna Discordia, since that Schism occasioned by the Antipopes lasted only eight Years?* But suppose his Adversary had called it a mere Neutrality; yet, upon the *Papist Principles*, the not acknowledging the true Vicar of Christ, and the not submitting to the Authority and Decrees of the supreme Head of the Catholic Church, did beyond all Doubt infer the Guilt of Schism. Moreover, the *Vindicator* hath not considered, that the

Prior

(y) *Bernard, Epist. 125.*

Prior says, *The Scots seem to have favoured too much the schismatical Antipope*, and therefore being perswaded of the Truth of that, he might, agreeably to his Principles, tax them with a Separation from the *Cisalpin*, and almost all the Church, because it had submitted to *Innocent*. And tho' the *Vindicator* thinks a Schism of seven or eight Years cannot be called *diuturna Discordia*, yet I believe the old *Prior* of *Hexam* would have reckoned a Schism of so many Months too long. And if this had been the first Time that King *David* with his *new modelled and erected Clergy*, was able to prevail with the *Barons* to submit to the Papal Authority, the *Prior* would have expressed it after another Manner, than in these Words: *Tunc vero divina Gratia inspirati, mandata Innocentii Papæ, & Legatum ejus, omnes unanimiter, cum magna veneratione susceperunt*. He would have rather spoke to this Purpose; "Then the *Scots* by the Inspiration
 " of the Holy Ghost renounced their former
 " *Heresies*, and *Separation* from the Catholic
 " Church, which had continued even from
 " the Time of their Conversion to Christiani-
 " ty: Then first they submitted to the Vicar
 " of Christ, the supreme visible Head of the
 " Church, and the only Center of Catholic
 " Unity: And in Testimony thereof, they un-
 " animously and with the greatest Veneration
 " received the Commands of Pope *Innocent*
 " and his *Legate*". But the *Vindicator* asks,
Whether

Whether or no the Writer of the Life, or the Romanists he favours, can prove from any History or Document, that before this Time, the Scottish Clergy and Laity had unanimously and with great Veneration owned the Pope, his Legates, Canons or Decrees? It is strange he did not remember, that Sir James (a) gives us from *Sim. Dunelmensis* a Copy of Pope Honorius's Letter, the Predecessor of Innocent the II. in which he tells the King, " That he had sent " John the Cardinal as his Legate, and there- " fore he charges him (*nobilitati tuæ rogando* " *mandamus*) to receive him with all Reve- " rence and Honour, and to cause the Bishops " of Scotland meet him in a Council when " called ". And it is unquestionable, that this John de Crema Priest and Cardinal, came to Roxburgh, Anno 1125, and executed his Commission with King David and his Bishops, about thirteen or fourteen Years, before Albericus Bishop of Ostia Legate of Pope Innocent held his Council at Carlisle. Sir James indeed pretends that Honorius's Letter insinuates a Jealousy the Pope had of the Respect the Bishops of Scotland would pay to the Cardinal. I am sure the Stile is high enough, *rogando mandamus*; and tho' he had been suspicious of the worst, it was not to be wondred at; since, as appears from the Letter, the Legate's Business was to inform himself fully in the Controversy between the Archbishop of York and the

(a) *Hist. Collect.* Page 251.

the *Scotish* Bishops, concerning their Dependance upon that *See*; and to examine the Pretensions of both Sides, the final Determination being reserved to the Pope himself. And it is worth the while to observe, That this Cardinal *de Crema* affected so much Grandeur and Power, that the *English* were not a little offended at him: And *Gervasius Dorovernensis* (b) taking notice of it says, That it was known both to the *English* and their Neighbours, that from *Austin* the Monk to *William* then Archbishop of *Canterbury*, all *Austin's* Successors were looked upon as Primates and Patriarchs, and never brought under the Jurisdiction of any Legate. Yet this is not to be understood as if there had never been Legates before that Time in *England*. Sir *James* says, It is likely this Council at *Roxburgh* may have been the first held in *Scotland* by Papal Authority: But of this he cannot be sure, and hence his *Vindicator* may be convinced, That the *Scots* had owned a Pope, and received his Commands and Legate with great Veneration before *Albericus* was sent by *Innocent II.* I cannot but Smile at his Witticism, when he says, *The Writer of the Life hath no Proof for this from Bede as clear as the Sun, nor from any other credible Writer.* The venerable *Bede* has deservedly a great Character, but I know none who took him ever for a Prophet; and the demanding a Proof from him of what happen'd, near 400 Years

(b) *Act. Pontif. Cantuar. inter 10. Script. Angl. Page 1663.*

Years after his Death, is of a Piece with his Argument, to prove that the *Culdees* did not conform to the Church of *Rome* before the fourteenth Century; because *Colman* refused to comply with the *Romish* Rites more than 600 Years before that Time. I leave it therefore to the Judgment of the Candid, whether Sir *James* and his *Vindicator* had any Shadow of Reason to infer from the above cited Words of *Richardus Hagulstadenſis*, That the *Scotiſh* Church before that Time did generally ſeparate from the *Romish* Church, &c. And ſince the *Culdees* continued near 200 Years after the Æra which Sir *James* has aſſigned to the Union of the *Scots* with the Church of *Rome*, and for a conſiderable Time concurred with the Canons to elect *Popiſh* Biſhops, it will be hard to perſwade any thinking Perſon, that theſe *Culdees* perſiſted in a ſeparate Communion, and ſtill maintained a Faith and Worſhip oppoſite to that of *Rome*, except that now and then they thought fit to be *occasional Conſormiſts*. And tho' I will not call it a ridiculous Fiction, becauſe that Expreſſion has made the *Vindicator* very angry, yet I am afraid the World will laugh at me for being at ſo much Pains to diſprove it.

BUT that I may diſſemble nothing that can be thought to favour our Adverſaries, I ſhall take notice of one Objection, which at the firſt Appearance ſeems to be of more Weight than all the reſt, and I wonder it did not oc-

cur to Sir *James* and his *Vindicator*. The fifth Canon of the Council of *Calcuith*, Anno 816, appoints that no *Scotsman* shall be allowed to Baptize, read *Divine Service*, administer the *Eucharist*, or perform any Part of the sacerdotal Office, because it was uncertain, whether, or by whom they were ordained. Now, tho' this seems, at the first View, to bid fair for the opposite Opinion; yet, if it be considered attentively and carefully, it will amount to nothing. It is not said here, that they had no Bishops in *Scotland*, nor that Ordinations were performed by Presbyters; either of these Things would have plainly determined the Case against us: But no such Thing was, or could have been meant or insinuated by this Council. We find from one of Archbishop *Theodorus's* *Capitula* (c), That the *Scotish* and *British Bishops*, who dissented from the *Catholic Church* in the *Tonsure* and keeping of *Easter*, were to have their Character confirmed, by receiving *Imposition of Hands* from a *Catholic Bishop*.

THIS Order was written by *Theodorus* long before the *Scots* conformed to the *Romish* Church; for he died Anno 690, that is, 26 Years before the Year 716. This Archbishop looked upon the *Scots* and *Britons* as Schismatics from the *Catholic Church*, because they did not observe the *Roman Rites*; and therefore he appointed their Bishops, when they embraced the *Romish* Communion, to be received

ceived with Imposition of Hands from a Catholic Bishop, after the Example of the *Nicene* Fathers, who ordered by their Eighth Canon, That the *Novatian* Clergy, who returned to the Communion of the Church, should be continued in their former Characters and Orders after Imposition of Hands. It was proved in Mr. *Sage's Life*, against Sir *James Dalrymple*, from undeniable Authorities, that the *Britons* had true and proper Bishops: And the Vindicator hath not thought fit to offer any Objections against those Testimonies. We have also proved evidently and fully, that the *Scots* had Bishops, and such Bishops, as the Popes themselves saluted by the ordinary Designation. The Meaning therefore of the aforecited Canon of the second Council at *Calcuith*, cannot be that the *Scots* were ordained by mere Presbyters. If the *English* Bishops assembled in this Council, had believed that the *Scots* wanted Bishops, and that Ordinations were performed by Presbyters amongst them, they would have given this for the Reason of the Prohibition, and would have plainly told, it was certain that the *Scots* were not in holy Orders, and that they had received their Ordination from those, who, according to the Rules and Principles of the Catholic Church, had no Power to confer Orders. The true Reason of it therefore must have been, That many *Scotish* Men came to *England*, pretending to be of the Clergy, who brought

brought no sufficient Credentials or commendatory Letters, by which it could be certainly known, that they were in Orders, or from whom they had received them. And withal, I think it not unlikely, that *Wulfrid*, then Archbishop of *Canterbury*, pretending to Jurisdiction over the *Scotish* Bishops, by virtue of the Power which Pope *Gregory* the Great gave to *Augustine* over all the Bishops of *Britain*, was offended at the *Scotish* Bishops for not submitting to him as their *Metropolitan*, and receiving Consecration from him; and therefore, out of Resentment, the *English* Clergy did forbid by this Canon the Allowance of any *Scotish* Man to perform any Acts of the sacerdotal Office within their Precincts. Were I not hastning to a Close, I could make it appear, that as early as we have Documents, the Archbishop of *Canterbury* or *York* claimed a Superiority over the Bishops of *Scotland* as their *Suffragans*; and that these, on the other Hand, refused to acknowledge Subjection to any other Bishop, but the *Pope*.

To sum up this whole Matter in a few Words. It has been proved evidently, that the ancient *Scots* had Bishops, even when they differed from the *Romish* Church; that they renounced their distinguishing Rites and Customs in the Year 716, and conformed to the Church of *Rome*; that Five Years thereafter, *Sedulius Britanniae Episcopus de genere Scotorum*, and *Fergusus Pictus Scotiae Episcopus*, were

were present, and subscribed at a Council in *Rome*, *Anno* 721, under Pope *Gregory* the II. and that, according to the Opinion of the most learned Antiquaries, Two Bishops from *Scotland* (One of which seems to have been Bishop of *Hyr*) subscribed to the *Northumbrian* Synod *Anno* 785 or 787, where one of the Pope's Legates was present. And tho' we have but very few and imperfect Accounts of the ancient *Scotish* Church; yet, in all the Records, Charters, and other written Documents, as well as printed Histories, that are extant, we find nothing, but what must persuade us, that the *Scots* were as much of the *Romish* Religion and Communion as the *English*.

Fordon tells us, *That the Privileges and Immunities which King Gregory gave to the Church and Churchmen, were confirmed by Pope John the Eighth*: And the Chronology agrees exactly well; for *Gregory* got the Crown *Anno* 872, and *John* was promoted to the Papal Chair 873, and enjoyed the Pontificate Ten Years.

IN the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, our Historians give us the Names of several Bishops, some of which went to *Rome*, not only for *Devotion*, but *Confirmation*; and from them the Succession is continued down in the See of *St. Andrew's* to the later Times. Both our own and the *English* Historians mention a *Scotish* Bishop called *Beornelm*, who defended the married Clergy in the Council of *Calne*, *Anno* 978:

But

But none of them inform us of his Diocess. It is certain he could not be Bishop of *Kilrimont* or *St. Andrew's*; because we have the Names of the Bishops of that See for many Years before this Time, and downwards: And the Bishopric of *Murthlach* or *Aberdeen*, was not founded for many Years after it. By consequence, we had more Bishops in *Scotland* at that Time, than the Bishop of *St. Andrew's*, tho' they were not endow'd with Lands and Temporalities. And this is abundantly confirm'd by one of our greatest Antiquaries, the learn'd Sir *James Balfour*, who (in his MS. concerning the Bishops of *Kilrimont*) testifies, he had seen a Deed of *Kellach* (whom he reckons the Third Bishop of that See) to the Religious *Culdees* of *Lochlevin*, where he styles himself *Maximus Scotorum Episcopus*: To which also agrees the Inscription upon *Fothad's* New Testament, in the *Excerpts* from the *Register* of the *Priory* of *St. Andrew's*: *Fothet qui Scotis summus Episcopus est*. And it is much the same, tho' we should prefer the different Readings of *Fordon* and *Winton*: For none can deny, but *primus Scotus Episcopus*, and *primus Scotiæ Episcopus*, may signify the same with *maximus* or *summus Scotiæ Episcopus*: And not only so, but the Proofs that have been brought for *Scotish* Episcopacy being consider'd, they can be taken in no other Meaning. Nay Sir *James* himself owns, (x)

K

That

(x) *Hist. Collect.* p. 128.

That after Bishoprics were erected in Scotland, the Bishop of Kilrimont or St. Andrew's, was, per excellentiam, called, *Episcopus Scottorum*, because he was more ancient, greater, and had the Precedency. If it was so then, much more it must have been so when the Bishop of St. Andrew's was the only Prelate who enjoy'd Temporalities; and the other Bishops had probably no other Revenues, but the Offerings of the Faithful. Nennius, who lived in the Ninth Century, according to the latest Computation, mentioning *Wedale* (y) calls it, a Village in the Province of Lodene, now subject to the Bishop of St. Andrew's in Scotland, distant six Miles westward from that once famous and renown'd Monastery of Melrofs. King Malcolm II. founded the Bishopric of *Murthlach* in Honour of St. *Moloch*, as our Historians affirm: And Fordon says, *Beyn* was promoted to be the first Bishop by Pope Benedict at the King's Entreaty. That Benedict VIII. was contemporary with Malcolm II. is beyond doubt: And this very *Beyn* was afterwards canonized, and is to be found in some of the Calendars under the Designation of *Sanctus Beanus*. The Charter of King *Duncan*, one of the eldest we have, has as much of the *Popish Stile*, as if it had been dictated by a *Capuchin* at

(y) *Wedale est villa in Provincia Lodinesie nunc vero Juris Episcopi sancti Andreæ Scotiæ sex milliaria ab occidentale parte ab illo quondam nobili & eximio Monasterio de Melrofs, Nen. Hist. Brit. pag. 114. c. 63. Edit. Gale.*

at this Day: *Dedit in Elemosyna sancto Cuthberto & suis servitoribus ----- hoc dedi pro me ipso, & anima patris mei, & pro fratribus meis, &c. qui autem istud voluerit destruere ----- maledictionem Dei, & sancti Cuthberti, & meam habeat.* So in the Charter of *Alexander I.* directed *Episcopis, &c.* we read thus: *Ut Ecclesia Dei ibi, pro me, & pro anima Regina Sybillæ ibi defunctæ fabricetur, &c.* Nay the *Culdees* themselves were Witnesses to superstitious Deeds and Grants. By the Contract between *William* Bishop of *St. Andrew's* and the *Culdees* of *Monimusk*, these were oblig'd to swear Fidelity to the Bishop; to present Three, out of which one was to be chosen by the Bishop to be their *Prior* or *Magister*; and when the Bishop came to reside at *Monimusk*, they were to receive him with a solemn Procession. The *Culdees* of *St. Andrew's* being in stead of a *Chapter*, choosed the Bishops for many Years; and they elected Bishops as *Papish* as could be found in the Monasteries of *Durham* or *Canterbury*, such as *Turgot, Eadmer, &c.* Nay the *Culdees* themselves never made any Scruple to wear a *Mitre*; as *Gregory* Bishop of *Dunkeld*, *Andrew* Bishop of *Caithness*, and *Catharus* chosen Bishop of *St. Andrew's*, but who died before he was consecrated. Neither did these *puritan* Bishops refuse the ordinary Designations: *Ego Gregorius Episcopus autoritate Dei & sanctorum Apostolorum Petri & Pauli, & sancti Andreae*

Apostoli. They were never accused of Herefy or Schism by their greatest Enemies. They receiv'd Protection, Grants and Favours, from Kings and Bishops, who were undoubtedly of the *Romish* Communion, and made it their chief Care to favour and endow Canons and Monks of a later Institution. And tho' they met with much Opposition, and were involved in many Difficulties, because they would not tamely part with their Rights, and suffer themselves to be deprived of their Revenues and Privileges in favour of the Monkish Intruders; yet according to the Confession of our Adversaries, they continued near 200 Years after the King, Clergy, Barons, and People had own'd the Pope's Authority, receiv'd his Bulls, and obey'd his Legates. Add to all these, that the *Culdees* in *England* and *Ireland* were undoubtedly as much *Romish*, as any other *Religious* of that Nation. But if, all these Things notwithstanding, Sir *James* and his *Vindicator* will still have the *Scotish Culdees* to have been *Separatists*, and *Presbyterians* too, they shall have leave for me, to enjoy their beloved Opinion.

C H A P. X.

WE are at last come to what the *Vindicator* calls *the Conclusion of that which relates to the Ecclesiastical Part*. How well Sir *James* has executed his Designs, I leave to be judg'd by others. I am very glad to find the *Vindicator* not only affirms, but proves, that the Church of *England* was own'd by the Kirk of *Scotland* to be a lawfully constituted Church of Christ: But I remember very well, after the famous Mr. *Sage* had prov'd from many Arguments, that our Reformers did acknowledge the Communion of the Church of *England* to be lawful, and that they did communicate with her as oft as they had Occasion; and had particularly brought for this End the *Vindicator's* first Argument, from the *Letter* of the *Assembly* of the Church of *Scotland* 1566, address'd to the *Bishops and Pastors* of *England* who have renounc'd the *Romish Antichrist*, and do profess with them the *Lord Jesus in Sincerity*; after many Years a Pamphlet was publish'd, the main Design of which was to show, that our *Reformers* did never join in the Communion of the Church of *England*, nor could with a safe Conscience have done it: And this very Performance was highly applauded by our *Presbyterians*. The Answer which that Author gives

to this Address of the Assembly's Letter, is that *it proves the Church of England was of the same Religion, tho' not of the same Communion with the Church of Scotland.* And if the *Vindicator* means no more, I think he might have sav'd himself some Trouble: The Church of *England* will not reckon his Compliment very great; for as much could have been said of the ancient *Scots* with respect to the *Saxons*, when the former refus'd so much as to eat or converse with the later: And the *Novatians* agreed with the Catholic Church in every thing except one Point of Disciplin; and yet they were ever esteem'd *Schismatics* by the whole Church in all Ages.

As the Presbyterians will not allow, that the *Assembly* did own Episcopacy to be lawful, tho' they saluted the Clergy of the Church of *England* by the Titles of *Bishops* and *Pastors*; so by Parity of Reason, whatever Thoughts Queen *Elizabeth* might have had concerning the *Orders* of the *Scotish* Kirk, yet her designing the Clergy thereof by the Title of the *Ministers of God's Word*, can never infer, that she believed their *Orders* were valid and unquestionable. This and such like are Compliments that pass of Course; and it is a known Maxim in the Schools: *Denominationes extrinsecæ nihil ponunt in re.*

THE *Treaty*, An. 1586, between King *James* and Queen *Elizabeth* will prove no more, but that the *Scots* and *English* profess'd the Christian

stian Religion, purg'd from the Corruptions of the *Romish* Church.

THE Church of *England* is, in my Opinion, the Church in the World at this Day, which comes nearest to the Primitive Church in Doctrine, Government and Worship; and is justly esteem'd the Strength and Bulwark, the Glory and Beauty of the Reformation. I will not take upon me to determine, what are her Sentiments concerning the present Kirk of *Scotland*. This I am sure of, she has declar'd herself for *Episcopacy* in her *Articles*: And by the *Act of Uniformity*, all who have not been ordain'd by Bishops are excluded from any Benefices in the Church of *England*, and from consecrating and administering the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. We are also inform'd from the *Life of Mr. Baxter*, that when *Anno* 1668, a Design was form'd by some for obtaining a *Comprehension* or *Toleration* to the *Nonconformists*; and the Business of *Reordination* occasion'd the greatest Difficulty; Sir *Matthew Hales* suggested this Expedient, that the *Nonconformists*, who had Ordination before, should be admitted into the Ministry of the Church of *England* with this Form: *Take thou legal Authority to preach the Word of God, and administer the holy Sacraments in any Congregation of England, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.* But when the *Parliament* met, the Design was entirely crush'd, and a Vote pass'd against bringing in a Bill of

this Nature. It is certain there are, and have been some Divines of that Church who believ'd the Divine Institution of Episcopacy ; and yet did not absolutely condemn all Ordinations by mere Presbyters as null and void : And it is as unquestionable that many others are of the contrary Thoughts. Let themselves therefore, who can best understand the Mind of their own Church, determin the Question. Some of them have answer'd the two Instances brought by the *Vindicator*, which, he thinks, do prove that the Church of *England* did not condemn the *Orders* conferred in the Kirk of *Scotland* : And for the *Vindicator's* Satisfaction, I shall beg leave to set down their Answers in the Words of the latest and most celebrated Historian of that Church.

THE first of these Instances, which the *Vindicator* reckons his third Proof, is taken from the *Life of Archbishop Grindal, lately publish'd, giving an Account*, “ That a Licence to administer holy Things throughout the Province of *Canterbury*, was granted by Doctor *Aubry*, who at that time executed the Office of Vicar-General (*Archbishop Grindal* being then under Suspension) to one *John Morison* a *Scotsman*, who had receiv'd his Orders in *Scotland*, according to the Way of ordaining Ministers in the Reform'd Church there. ” To this the most learn'd Mr. *Collier* (a) answers thus : “ By the Mention of Impos-

(a) *Eccles. Hist. Tom. 2. pag. 579.*

“ Imposition of Hands, it appears this *Morison*
 “ was ordain’d by the *second* Book of *Scots*
 “ *Disciplin*, for the first won’t allow of this
 “ Ceremony. Farther, by the Clauses of,
 “ *Quantum in nobis est, & de jure possumus, &*
 “ *quatenus jura regni patiuntur*, ’Tis pretty
 “ plain *Aubrey* was somewhat conscious of a
 “ Strain upon the *English* Constitution: And
 “ that the Archbishop was not so firm to Epif-
 “ copal Right, and Apostolical Succession, as
 “ might have been expected. ” The same
 learn’d Historian speaking of Archbishop
Usher says: (b) “ This learn’d Prelate seem’d
 “ to have an Over-balance of Affection for the
 “ foreign Protestant Churches. This put him
 “ upon some Strain to vindicate their Orders,
 “ and make their Ministrations valid. For
 “ this Purpose he reviv’d the Novelty of some
 “ of the Schoolmen, and made no Scruple to
 “ affirm, that the Office of Bishop and Priest
 “ was the same as to Substance, and only dif-
 “ ferent Degrees of the same Order. Bishop
 “ *Davenant* was likewise of *Usher*’s Opinion
 “ in this Point. But with all reasonable De-
 “ ference to this most learned Primate, there
 “ appears more Charity than Caution in this
 “ Latitude. This straining of Courtesy for the
 “ Protestants abroad, seems to throw us off
 “ our Guard, and weaken the *English* Refor-
 “ mation. ’Tis the safest Way to keep close
 “ to the earliest Ages. These were Times of
 “ Light

(b) *Eccles. Hist. Tom. 2. pag. 868.*

“ Light and Truth, of Zeal and Union, of
 “ Disinterestedness and Courage: ’Tis dangerous
 “ to cross upon the Judgment of the first five
 “ Centuries, and desert the Practice of the
 “ Primitive Church. As for the modern Di-
 “ stinctions of Christianity, it may, in my humble
 “ Opinion, be most adviseable to stand *aloof*;
 “ and wish them well, to leave them to their
 “ own Recollection and God’s Mercy: To
 “ pray their Prejudices may be no longer too
 “ strong for them: That they may disengage
 “ from their Novelties, and govern themselves
 “ by the ancient Standard. As to the Arch-
 “ bishop’s Opinion upon this Question, ’tis
 “ somewhat remarkable, considering his pub-
 “ lishing St. *Ignatius*’s Epistles: For in the ge-
 “ nuin Writings of this *Martyr*, the Distin-
 “ ction between Bishop and Priest is plainly
 “ mark’d; the Prerogative of the former set
 “ very high, and the supreme Direction of
 “ Ecclesiastical Affairs lodg’d with him. But
 “ notwithstanding this charitable Byass, *Usher*
 “ made no Difficulty to censure the Practice
 “ of the *English* and *Scots* Presbyterians. He
 “ would neither allow their Orders, nor com-
 “ municate with them. He charg’d them with
 “ downright Perjury and Revolt from their
 “ Bishops: To whom they had engag’d their
 “ Faith and sworn canonical Obedience: That
 “ their Ministrations were sacrilegious Inva-
 “ sions of the *Episcopal* Privilege, and that they
 “ had no Colour for their Schism. And here

“ it must be observ’d, that this Archbishop,
 “ notwithstanding his Relaxations already men-
 “ tioned, maintain’d that Bishops had a pecu-
 “ liar Extent of spiritual Authority. That this
 “ Superiority was no Concession of Councils,
 “ no Privileges of After-ages, but settl’d by the
 “ Apostles themselves. ”

THE second Instance is taken from Arch-
 bishop Spotswood at his Consecration, and of
 the Bishops of Brechin and Galloway, perfor-
 med by Commission from the King to the Bishops
 of London, Ely and Bath, 21st October Anno
 Dom. 1610, in the Chapel of London-House.
 “ In the mean Time, a Question was mov’d
 “ by Doctor *Andrews* Bishop of *Ely*, touching
 “ the Consecration of the *Scotish* Bishops,
 “ who, as he said, must first be ordained Pres-
 “ byters, as having received no Ordination
 “ from a Bishop. The Archbishop of *Canter-*
 “ *bury* Doctor *Bancroft*, who was by, main-
 “ tained ; That thereof there was no necessi-
 “ ty, seeing, where Bishops could not be had,
 “ the Ordination given by Presbyters must be
 “ esteemed lawful ; otherwise, that it might
 “ be doubted, if there was any lawful Voca-
 “ tion in most of the Reformed Churches.
 “ This being applauded by the other Bishops,
 “ *Ely* acquiesced, and the *Scotish* Bishops were
 “ consecrated ”. This is answered by Mr.
Colliar after this Manner : (c) “ With due
 “ Regard to *Bancroft’s* Memory, his Argu-
 “ ment

“ ment seems to stand upon a slender Bottom:
 “ For without doubt, neither *Luther* nor *Cal-*
 “ *vin*, *Beza* or *Zuinglius*, are the Standards
 “ of Discipline and Government, 'tis the pri-
 “ mative Plan we ought to proceed by in these
 “ Matters. And therefore if any modern
 “ Christians happen to refine upon Catholic
 “ Measures, and desert from the Government
 “ of the Church, settled for fifteen hundred
 “ Years together: If any Christians, I say,
 “ pretend to reform in this unfortunate Man-
 “ ner, tho' they may call for our Pity and our
 “ Prayers, they ought never to command our
 “ Imitation. And therefore, with Submission,
 “ it seems most adviseable to leave them to
 “ farther Recollection, and not make our selves
 “ a Party to their Singularities, by straining
 “ Courtesy, and interposing in their Defence.

“ But after all, as the learned *Heylin* re-
 “ presents the Matter, *Bancroft* went upon a
 “ much more defenceable Principle: He ar-
 “ gued, there was no necessity the *Scotish* Bi-
 “ shops should pass through the intermediate
 “ Orders of *Deacons* and *Priests*; for that
 “ the Episcopal Character might be fully con-
 “ vey'd at a single Consecration: And for
 “ this he cited some considerable Precedents
 “ in the ancient Church”. The learned Hi-
 “ storian doth instance in St. *Ambrose*, *Nectarius*
 “ and *Eucherius*. And (d) in another Place he
 “ tells us, “ That Mr. *James Sharp*, Mr. *Ha-*
 “ *milton*,

(d) *Tom. 2. Page 887.*

“ *milton*, Mr. *Barwel* (*Fairfoul*) and Mr.
 “ *Loghton* (*Leighton*) all in Presbyterian Or-
 “ ders, came to *London*; where, after being
 “ ordained Deacons and Priests, they were
 “ consecrated Bishops by the Bishop of *Win-*
 “ *chester*, with the Assistance of two other
 “ *English* Prelates. At this Solemnity they
 “ expressly disclaim'd the Validity of their for-
 “ mer Ordination”. If the *Vindicator* thinks
 fit, he may reply to Mr. *Colliar*; for I will not
 take upon me to be Umpire in this Dispute.

THE *Vindicator* proceeds in the next Place,
 to add something in defence of what Sir *James*
 hath advanced in the *Preface* to his *Collections*,
 concerning *Elizabeth Muir's* Marriage, and
 the Legitimacy of *Robert III. &c.* one would
 be ready to gather from these Words and the
 Title Page, that Mr. *Sage* had declared him-
 self against the Legitimacy of King *Robert*:
 But the whole Controversy is only, Whether
 or no *John Major* agreed with our other Hi-
 storians in their false Relation concerning the
 Bastardy of that King. Sir *James* would have
Major's Text to be altered and inverted after
 a surprising Manner, that he may be forced to
 narrate the same notorious Falshood with *For-*
don. Mr. *Sage* discovered, in the *Preface* to
Hatbornden's Works, the Unreasonableness of
 this Method: All that Sir *James* and his *Vin-*
dicator has said to justify their bold Corrup-
 tion of the Text, amounts to no more but
 this, that otherwise *Major* must be inconsi-
 stent

flent with himself; as if, forsooth, it were a very rare Thing to see an Author careless and inadvertent. I have observed several other Assertions, and a great many Inferences, both in Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs, that are contained in Sir *James's Collections*, which I have neither Leisure, Opportunity, or Inclination to pursue; far less will I trouble my self to examine this Dispute which is of no Moment.

THE ingenious and learned Mr. *Thomas Innes*, Author of the *Charta Authentica*, is concerned in this Affair: The *Vindicator*, as it were, gives him a Challenge to do Justice to himself and Mr. *Sage*; and no doubt that great Antiquary and Critic (tho' they should call me a *Canaanite*, I must give the Gentleman what he deserves) will take notice of it, if he can think it worth the while. I have already shown that the *Vindicator* had no Reason to accuse the Author of Mr. *Sage's* Life, of having treated Sir *James* indecently; and I must add, That I do not see wherein Mr. *Sage* has transgressed the Rules of Civility, with Respect either to him or the late Earl of *Cromerty*. I have a great Honour for the Memory of this noble Lord: He was undoubtedly Master of a great many excellent Endowments, he was a Lover of Learning, and a Patron of learned Men, and therefore *requiescat in pace*. The *Vindicator* would insinuate, *That the Author of Mr. Sage's Life had taken too much Liberty with the right Reverend and eminent*

eminent Prelates and other Divines of the Church of England, and made shrewd Reflections upon the legal Settlement in the Protestant-Line. I have very carefully considered that *Life*, and I cannot discover the least *Innuendo* that Way: But if it were otherwise, let the Author answer for it. My Business has been to examine some Things relating to the ancient Government and Religion of the *Scottish Church*, and I have endeavoured to do it with all *Caution* and *Discretion*; and tho' I have been obliged to differ from Sir *James* and his *Vindicator*, yet, I hope, that cannot be reckoned a Crime. Every Man of Sense will take care not to transgress the Laws of Decency; Civility is what is due to the Meanest of the Creation, and much more to a Gentleman who has deserved so well of his Country. I shall be heartily sorry, if there be found so much as one unguarded Expression, which is capable of being misconstrued, or strain'd to a hard Meaning: But if nothing less will satisfy but to betray the Truth, and cowardly give up the Honour and Beauty (not to say more) of the ancient *Scottish Church*, I must beg that worthy Gentleman's Pardon; for no candid and honest Man will purchase the Friendship of any at so dear a Price.

F I N I S.

From

*From the Cartulary of St. Andrew's, Folio's
50, 51, and 52.*

SUB compendiosi sermonis tractatu dignum duxi inquirendam summam luculento sermone omnes Redditus tam prædiorum cum suis finibus et terminis, quam Ecclesiarum et aliorum reddituum ex antiquis dominationibus et collationibus Regum Scotie ad Ecclesiam Sancti Servani de Insula Lochlevine ex antiquo jure Spectantes redigere, ne Supervacua questio et tumultuosa disceptatio Aures Regum et Principum et Pontificum temporis tractu inutiliter percellat. Et ea que in Subsequentibus breviloquio tangemus, omnibus ambagibus abjectis et circumscriptis veteris voluminis antiquo Scotorum Idiomate conscripti: Memoriali recordatione apud presentes, et in extermalibi perpetuali insinuatione declarat Scriptura ad posteros.

De primo Rege, qui dedit Insulam Lochlevin.

BRUDE filius Dergard, qui ultimus Regum Pictorum secundum antiquas traditiones fuisse recolitur, contulit Insulam Lochlevine Deo omnipotenti et Sancto Servano et Keledeis Hermitis ibidem commorantibus et Deo Servientibus et Servituris in illa Insula. Et prefati Keledei dederunt locum Cellule Episcopo Sancti Andree sub tali forma, quod Episcopus exhiberet eis victum et vestitum, et ne ignoretur quis contulit Episcopo locum ibi Romanus Monachus et Abbas vir admirande Sanctitatis primo concessit precario locum ibi Episcopo Sciz. Fothath filio Bren, qui nunc et tunc per totam Scotiam fuit celebris et satis commendabilis vite. Prefatus Episcopus dedit benedictionem suam plenarie omnibus his, qui observarent conventionem istam et amicitiam initam inter Episcopum et Keledeos Et versa vice dedit maledictionem suam omnibus Episcopis qui infirmarent et revocarent prefatam Conventionem.

Qualiter Macbet filius Finlach et Gruoch dederunt Sancto Servano Kirkenes.

MACBET filius Finlach contulit pro Suffragiis orationum et Gruoch, filia Bodhe Rex et Regina Scotorum Kirkenes Deo omnipotenti et Keledeis prefate Insule Lochlevin cum suis finibus et terminis. Hi enim sunt fines et termini de Kirkenes et villule que dicitur Porthmokanene de loco Moneloccodhan usque ad amnem qui dicitur Levin. Et hoc in latitudine Sicut a publica strata que ducit apud Hinhirkethyn usque ad Saxum Hiberniensium, et hoc in longitudine. Et dicitur Saxum Hiberniensium, quia Malcolmus Rex filius Duncani concessit eis Salinagi-

um quod Scotice dicitur Thonnane. Et venerunt Hibernienses ad Kirkenes ad domum cujusdam viri nomine Mochan, qui tunc fuit absens, et solummodo Mulieres erant in domo, quas oppresserunt violenter Hibernienses non tum rubore et verecundia. Rei etiam eventu ad aures prefati Mochan pervento, iter quam otius domi festinavit, et invenit ibi Hibernienses in eadem domo cum matre sua. Exhortatione tamen Matri suæ sepius facta ut extra domum veniret, que nullatenus voluit, sed Hibernienses voluit protegere et eis pacem dare, quos omnes prefatus vir in ultionem tanti facinoris ut oppressores Mulierum, et Barbaros et Sacrilegos in medio flamme ignis una cum matre sua viriliter combussit. Et ex hac causa dicitur locus ille Saxum Hiberniensium.

De libertate Kirkenes Collata a Rege Macbet filio Finlach et a Gruoch Regina.

CUM omni libertate collata fuit villa de Kirkenes Deo omnipotenti et Keledeis absque omni munere et onere et exactione Regis et filii Regis Vicecomitis et alicujus et sine refectione pontis et sine exercitu et venatione Sciz. pietatis intuitu et orationum Suffragiis fuit Deo omnipotenti collata.

De Collatione et libertate de Petnemokane.

EDGARUS filius Malcolmi Rex Scotie contulit in Elemosinam Deo omnipotenti et predictis Keledeis Petnemokanne cum omnibus libertatibus sicut prenotatum est in Capitulo precedenti.

De villa de Ballecrifstyn et ejus libertate.

MALCOLMUS Rex et Margareta Regina Scotie contulerunt devote Villam de Ballecrifstin Deo omnipotenti et Keledeis de Lochlevin cum eadem libertate ut prius.

De libertatibus Villarum de Kirkenes et de Pettenmokan.

DOVENALD filius Cenchat Regis dedit omnimoda libertate duabus villis Sciz. de Kirkenes et de Pettenmokane cum ceteris Regibus Sciz. Duncano, Rege Edgardo et Alexandro et Davide fratribus eidem, et omnibus villis quasunque tunc habuerunt vel postea habere potuerunt.

De donatione de Admore et ejus libertate.

ÆDELRADUS vir venerande memoriæ filius Malcolmi Regis Scotie, Abbas de Dunkelden et insuper Comes de Fyfe contulit Deo Omnipotenti et Sancto Servano et Keledeis de Insula Lochlevin cum summa reverentia et honore et omni libertate et sine exactione et petitione cujusquam in mundo, Episcopi

vel Regis vel Comitis Admore cum suis rectis terminis et divisis. Et ipsa illa terra possessio illi fuit tradita a parentibus suis cum esset in juvenili etate cum magna affectione et amore illum optulit Deo et Sancto Servano et prefatis viris Deo servantibus et ibidem servituris. Et istam Collationem et Donationem primo factam confirmaverunt duo fratres Hedelradi scilicet David et Alexander in presentia multorum virorum fide dignorum scilicet Constantini Comitis de Fyfe viri discretissimi et Nefse et Cormac filii Macbeath et Malnethte filii Beollani Sacerdotum de Abernythy et Mallebride alterius Sacerdotis et Thuadhel et Augustini Sacerdotis Keledeorum, et Berbeadh Rectoris Scholarum de Abernythyn et coram Cetibus totius Universitatis tunc de Abernethyn, ibidem degentibus, et coram Deo Omnipotente et omnibus Sanctis. Et ibi data est plenarie et universaliter ab omnibus Sacerdotibus, Clericis et Laicis Maledictio Dei Omnipotentis et Beate Marie Virginis et omnium Sanctorum, ut Dominus Deus daret eum in exterminum et perditionem et in omnes illos quicunque irritarent et revocarent et diminuerent elemosinam de Admore, omni populo respondente, Amen.

De donatione Ecclesie de Marckinsh per Malduinum Episcopum.

MALDUINUS Episcopus Sancti Andree contulit Ecclesiam de Markinsh cum tota terra honorifice et devote Deo et Sancto Servano et Keledeis de Insula Lochlevin cum prefata libertate.

De Concessione Ecclesie de Sconyn per Tuadal Episcopum.

TUADAL Episcopus, Sancti Andree contulit Ecclesiam de Sconyn prefatis viris Religiosis devote et integre cum omni libertate et honore pro Suffragiis orationum.

De Ecclesia de Hurkyndorath.

MODATH filius Malmykel vir piissime recordationis Episcopus Sancti Andree cujus vita et doctrina tota Regio Scottorum feliciter est illustrata, contulit Deo et Sancto Servano et Keledeis heremitis apud Insulam Lochleven in Scola virtutum ibidem degentibus devote et honorifice cum prefatis libertatibus Ecclesiam de Hurkenedorath. Iste sunt antike prestationes et Canones, quas prefate Ecclesie Solvebant antiquitus, Scilicet. triginta panes decoctos cum antiqua mensura farine ibi apposita, triginta Caseos quorum quilibet facit Chudreme et octo male de braseo, et Derchede male et Chedher male.

l

le
a-

if-
o-
et
am
ous
et
in-
tri-
de